

9-25-2013

Immigration and Nationalism in Greece

Cynthia H. Malakasis

Florida International University, cmserena@gmail.com

DOI: 10.25148/etd.FI14040854

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Malakasis, Cynthia H., "Immigration and Nationalism in Greece" (2013). *FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 1280.
<http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/etd/1280>

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the University Graduate School at FIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of FIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcc@fiu.edu.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Miami, Florida

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALISM IN GREECE

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

GLOBAL AND SOCIOCULTURAL STUDIES

by

Cynthia Helen Malakasis

2014

To: Dean Kenneth G. Furton
College of Arts and Sciences

This thesis, written by Cynthia Helen Malakasis, and entitled Immigration and Nationalism in Greece, having been approved in respect to style and intellectual content, is referred to you for judgment.

We have read this thesis and recommend that it be approved.

Roderick Neumann

Alex Stepick

Rebecca Friedman

Anna Triandafyllidou

Sarah J. Mahler, Major Professor

Date of Defense: September 25, 2013

The thesis of Cynthia Helen Malakasis is approved.

Dean Kenneth G. Furton
College of Arts and Sciences

Dean Lakshmi N. Reddi
University Graduate School

Florida International University, 2014

© Copyright 2014 by Cynthia Helen Malakasis

All rights reserved.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my father, the late Professor John T. Malakasis, whose shining intellect, boundless love, and unwavering care and attention throughout the first 24 years of my life laid the world open for me, making possible this journey of exploration, achievement, and socially-mindful scholarship. I miss you, always.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all the friends, family members, colleagues and professors who stood by me during the seven years of my graduate career, making this work possible.

In the university, my advisor, Dr. Sarah J. Mahler, but also my other committee members, Drs. Rod Neumann, Alex Stepick, Rebecca Friedman, and Anna Triandafyllidou. Dr. Mahler's exacting standards of writing and analysis ensured the quality of this dissertation; what is more, my advisor kept pushing me forward until the last minute, and thus made sure I saw this project to its completion. Dr. Neumann's insights on the ideology of nationalism were key in the way I positioned myself and this study theoretically. Dr. Stepick was also critical in this respect, but I'm also grateful for his friendly and supportive presence throughout. Dr. Friedman helped me keep in mind that my case study informs and is informed by the broader European context. Even though the committee's external member, Dr. Triandafyllidou took this project personally, read through all my drafts diligently, and demanded that even the details were well crafted.

Florida International University was very generous in providing me with financial assistance throughout my graduate career, in the form of teaching assistantships, a Doctoral Evidence Acquisition Fellowship, and a Dissertation Year Fellowship. The Miami-Florida European Union Center of Excellence also supported me through a research assistantship, as well as a Graduate Student Doctoral Research Award.

Friends and family members who stood by me particularly during the writing period, reminding me of their love and concern or dragging me away from my books and

laptop for much-needed relaxation are too many to name here. A few merit special mention. Even during a period of life-threatening illness, fellow Team Mahler member Sharon Placide was constantly available to talk me past the agonizing doubts that this project would ever reach completion. My cousin, Natasa Papakonstantinou, generously offered me a classroom in her language school every time I needed a writing space during visits to our hometown. My mother, Dina Papakonstantinou, my sisters, Caroline and Tasia Malakasis, and my nephew, Kelly Malakasis Hay, endured my emotional and physical absence and frequent self-absorption during the years I spent preparing my research proposal, conducting fieldwork, and finally writing my dissertation with considerable grace and sympathy. Last, yet anything but least, two women, whose multifaceted support made it possible for me to complete this process with my sanity more or less intact. Maria Polatidou and Karolina Schismenou, you know you are family by now.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION
IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALISM IN GREECE

by

Cynthia Helen Malakasis

Florida International University, 2014

Miami, Florida

Professor Sarah J. Mahler, Major Professor

A source of emigration until the early 1970s, Greece has become home to a rising tide of immigrants since 1991, and its foreign-born population rose from below one to over 11 percent. Equally important is the fact that the Greek state has historically premised national belonging on ethnicity, and striven to exclude people who did not exhibit Greek ethnic traits. My study examines how immigration has challenged this nationalist model of ethnically homogeneous belonging. Further, it uses the Greek case to problematize the hegemonic assumption that the nationalist model of social organization is a human universal. Data consist of reactions to a 2010 landmark law that constituted the first *jus soli* bill in the nation's history, and include a plurality of voices found in parliamentary proceedings, newspapers, a government-sponsored online forum and Facebook discussions. Voices examined correspond to three main conceptual camps: people who premise belonging on ethnicity and hegemonic definitions of what it means to be Greek, people who mitigate nationalist norms enough to include immigrants, but reproduce a nationalist worldview, and people who seek to divorce political belonging from ethnicity altogether.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
I. Introduction	1
II. Research problem and Background	3
III. The Greek Case Study – Why Study Greece	13
The European Context	17
The Greek Case	23
The Crisis Context	30
IV. Analytical Lens: Boundaries and Power	32
V. My Own Perspective	37
 Chapter 2: Nationalism and Ethnicity, and the Greek Nation-Building Process	 40
I. Introduction	40
II. The Origins of the Nation as a Social Form	42
The Nation as a Social Form Emerging with Modernity	43
The Theorists	43
(How) Do People Embrace Nationalism?	48
Ethno-Symbolism: The Nation as a Human Universal	50
Theories of Culture and Ethnicity	54
III. From Ethnic Coexistence to <i>Homo Nationalis</i> : The Greek Case	58
Heterogeneity as a Human Norm	58
From <i>Rum Millet</i> to the Nation of the <i>Hellenes</i>	64
Creating <i>Homo Nationalis</i>	73
IV. Conclusions	81
 Chapter 3: Research Design	 83
I. Introduction	83
II. Data Collection	84
Official Political Discourses	85
Newspapers	86
Online Fora	88
III. Data Analysis	92
Introduction	92
Analytical Methodology	93
The Analytical Process	95
Open Coding	95
Theoretical Coding	97
Data Sets	99
Online Fora	99
Open Gov	99
Facebook	102
Official Political Discourses	107

	Newspapers	108
IV.	Findings	109
	Introduction	109
	Conceptual Categories and their Properties	110
	The Range of Voices	118
	Presentation of Findings in the Data Chapters	119
Chapter 4: Debates on Mobility and Mixture		122
I.	Introduction	122
	Chapter Structure	126
	Theoretical Foundation	129
II.	Cross-Border Mobility	132
III.	Ethnic Mixture	154
IV.	Europe, Greece, and the Others	162
V.	Conclusions	169
Chapter 5: (Re)Considering the Norm of Ethnic Descent		173
I.	Introduction	173
	Chapter Structure	177
II.	The Principle of Ethnic Descent	179
	Introduction	179
	Ethnic Descent: Valid and Salient	181
	<i>Ithageneia</i> versus <i>Ipikootita</i>	187
	Ethnic Descent: Invalid and not Salient	193
	Blood against Soil: <i>Omogeneis</i> versus Immigrants	199
III.	Becoming Greek: The Alternative of Ethno-Cultural Assimilation	205
IV.	The Principle of Stakeholding	212
V.	Conclusions	216
Chapter 6: Nationality as a Matter of Citizenship		221
I.	Introduction	221
	Chapter Structure	228
	Theoretical Foundation	229
II.	National Membership as a Right, and “the Right to Have Rights”	231
	Is Nationality Sufficient?	239
III.	Immigrant Membership and its Effects on Collective Goods	242
	Democracy and the Rule of Law	242
	Employment and Public Spending	246
	Social Cohesion, Order, Solidarity and Cohesion	248
IV.	Conclusions	250
Chapter 7: Conclusions		252
I.	Introduction	252
II.	Research Problems and Questions	253
III.	Findings and Contributions	259

	The Greek National Context	259
	National Identities and the Other	262
	Nationalism	264
IV.	Limitations and Directions for Future Research	265
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	267
	VITA	285

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Political Parties' Positions towards the <i>Jus Soli</i> Bill	27
2. Open Coding Example	96
3. Newspaper Articles by Genre	109
4. Representing Cross-Border Mobility as Excessive and Out of Control	136
5. Representing Cross-Border Mobility as Illegal	140
6. Representing Cross-Border Mobility as Abnormal and Detrimental	141
7. Representing Cross-Border Mobility as Excessive, but Under Control	144
8. Representing Cross-Border Mobility as Conditionally Legal	146
9. Representing Cross-Border Mobility as Trauma	149
10. Representing Cross-Border Mobility as Not Excessive or Out of Control	151
11. Representing Legality as Arbitrary	152
12. Representing Cross-Border Mobility as Normal and Productive	153
13. Representing Ethno-Cultural Mixture as Normal and Productive	157
14. Representing Ethno-Cultural Mixture as Conditionally Normal and Productive	158
15. Representing Ethno-Cultural Mixture as Abnormal and Aberrant	160
16. Europeanness Should Determine National Boundaries	168
17. Europeanness Should not Determine National Boundaries	169
18. Representing Ethnic Descent as Valid and Salient	187
19. <i>Ithageneia</i> versus <i>Ipikootita</i>	192
20. Representing Ethnic Descent as Conceptually Invalid and Not Salient	198
21. <i>Omogeneis</i> Have a Stronger Claim to Membership than Immigrants	204

22.	<i>Omogeneis</i> and Immigrants Are Equally Entitled to Membership	205
23.	Immigrants Have a Stronger Claim to Membership than <i>Omogeneis</i>	205
24.	Ethnic Assimilation Should Be Required for Membership	210
25.	Ethnic Assimilation Should not Be Required for Membership	211
26.	Representing Stakeholding as the Primary Marker of National Membership	216
27.	National Membership is a Right, and a Right to Rights	234
28.	National Membership is not a Right	236
29.	National Membership Should Be Put to a Referendum	237
30.	National Membership Should not Be Put to a Referendum	238
31.	Disputing Nationality as an Avenue to Rights	242
32.	Nationality Enhances Democracy, Equality, Justice, and the Rule of Law	245
33.	Nationality Hurts Democracy, Equality, Justice, and the Rule of Law	246
34.	Nationality Hurts Resources such as Jobs and Public Benefits	247
35.	Nationality Enhances Resources such as Jobs and Public Benefits	248
36.	Nationality Hurts Social Cohesion, Order, and Solidarity	249
37.	Nationality Enhances Social Cohesion, Order, and Solidarity	250

LIST OF ACRONYMS

PASOK ¹	Socialist Party of Greece (Center-Left Ruling Party)
ND	New Democracy (Center-Right Main Opposition Party)
KKE	Communist Party of Greece
LAOS	Popular Orthodox Alarm (Far-Right Party)
SYRIZA	Coalition of the Radical Left
DSE	Democratic Army of Greece
EDES	National Republican Greek League
GNC	Greek Nationality Code
MP (MPs)	Member (or Members) of the Parliament
SNS	Social Network Site(s)

¹ Parties are listed in the order of seats they held in the Greek Parliament at the time of my study.

Chapter 1: Introduction

I. INTRODUCTION

Addressing his fellow legislators in Greece's National Assembly, the member of the first far-Right party to obtain seats there after the country's restoration to democracy three and a half decades before² rejected the notion that people of foreign descent, no matter what their ties to Greece, may become members of the Greek national community.

“If you belong to a nation, you derive this membership from descent,” Ilias Polatidis³ told his colleagues on March 9, 2010, on the first of three days during which Greece's lawmakers deliberated on whether to extend national membership to the children of immigrants who had been coming to the country en masse since the early 1990s. More importantly, ethno-biological ties ensured, in his mind, loyalty and allegiance.

“How will the Albanian's or the Pakistani's blood turn into water?” Polatidis said. “Because, if they can betray the *genus*⁴ to which they belong, that is if they allow us to call them Greek, will they not ‘spit on’ Greece with the first chance they get? If you are not born Greek, you cannot become Greek.”

² Following a military coup d'état by a group of colonels on April 21, 1967, Greece was ruled by a right-wing military regime for seven years, until July 1974 (e.g., Clogg 1987).

³ Greek names and words appearing throughout this manuscript have been transliterated following the Greek state's official ELOT 743 transliteration system; the online engine used may be found at <http://www.passport.gov.gr/elot-743.html>. The choice of this transliteration system reflects a desire for a systematic approach, as well as time constraints that prevented me from researching alternatives – for example, the system proposed by Robert Fitzgerald in his translation of the *Odyssey* that Neni Panourgia uses in her work (2009). It does *not* reflect any sort of ideologically motivated adherence to official Greek state norms. Following Panourgia, I exclude from this approach words, names and terms that have an already established spelling in English.

⁴ The term *genus* denotes “biological classification ranking between family and species” (Britannica 2007). Chapter Two provides a detailed discussion of the concept and its salience to Greek norms of collective membership.

Two days later, in the course of the same debate, a legislator from the ranks of the Radical Left told the Assembly the story of the Greek-born child of Nigerian immigrants – or, as he put it, “one of the hundreds of thousands of children of immigrants who were born in Greece, and were forced to become strangers.” Born, raised, and schooled in Greece, Nikos nevertheless went through a series of massive hurdles to avoid deportation when he turned 18, because his ties to the country did not, in the eyes of the law, make up for the fact that he lacked the necessary documents, Theodoros Dritsas told the Assembly.

“If you want, find the blood and a way to measure – where else? In labs and in biochemical tests – and see whether the blood of Nikos from Nigeria is any different from your children’s blood,” Dritsas told his parliamentary colleagues.

Polatidis and Dritsas are two out of a multitude of people whose views I examine in my dissertation in order to gauge whether and how mass immigration to Greece since the collapse of the Communist Bloc has compelled natives to (re)consider norms of collective membership. Clearly, these two public figures theorized immigrants and their claims to Greek national membership very differently. Theirs are two archetypal views that appear and reappear throughout my dissertation, and mark endpoints on a continuum of opinions I encountered in the course of my research. For now, they are introduced because these two very different views point to significant diversity in conceptions of collective belonging and social organization – a diversity that my study captures, analyzes and theorizes as indicative of the fact that, rather than fixed and uniform, views on the issue are multiple and very much contingent on people’s broader ideological context(s) and sociopolitical orientations.

Using Greece as a case study, my dissertation examines nationalism, an ideology that prescribes that a political unit should only encompass people who share a basic set of social perceptions, behaviors and features, commonly referred to as ethnic or cultural (Gellner 1983; Hobsbawm 1990), and that often naturalizes this affinity enough to attribute it to biological ties. More specifically, my study examines how nationalism, which has reigned in the world for some two centuries now, fares in circumstances of increasing mobility and diversification that *de facto* upset the neat socially organizing scheme nationalist actors have striven to construct. After this brief introductory section, I delve into my study's research problem, which I follow with an argument on the explanatory merits of Greece at the time of my research. Next, I discuss the analytical lens that frames my approach and my own "partial perspective" (Haraway 1988: 583) as a native anthropologist. The chapter ends with a brief summary of the remainder of my dissertation.

II. RESEARCH PROBLEM AND BACKGROUND

Returning now to the debate introduced at the beginning of this chapter – why does it take center stage in my investigation? The object of the debate was a bill, proposed in November 2009 by the recently elected Socialist Party (PASOK), which stood to mark a historic break with the way the category "Greek" had been defined throughout the two centuries of Greece's statehood. Since very early in the life of the Greek state, holding Greek ethnic descent has been the main avenue to collective membership (Christopoulos 2012; Tsitselikis 2006; Vogli 2008). *Jus sanguinis*, i.e., birth

to or, in Greece's case, generationally unlimited descent from actual or potential⁵ Greek nationals, became the exclusive mode of nationality⁶ acquisition as early as five years into Greece's statehood, when the new state passed its first nationality law in 1835, and has since persisted and even been fortified, as Chapter Two explicates. Crucially and according to key studies that have traced the history of Greek collective membership, this *legal* norm of collective belonging has historically corresponded to *sociocultural* ones, which form the topic of my dissertation. Historian Elpida Vogli (2008) attributes this nationality regime to, among other factors, the need to strengthen and perpetuate the "national myth" (Vogli 2008: 15) of unbroken Greek ethno-cultural continuity since Antiquity; a need which, Vogli argues, continues to foster an ethnic understanding of the political unit. Political scientist Dimitris Christopoulos (2012) posits a link between a descent-based, exclusionary nationality regime and popular, ethno-biological conceptions of belonging. Similarly, Konstantinos Tsitselikis (2006), who has researched Greek nationality mostly from the perspective of minority rights, argues that Greek nationality law has historically reflected a perception of membership in the Greek state as identical to membership in the Greek ethnic group.

Laws determining access to nationality, then, have been consistently crafted to reflect and promote a normative conception of the body politic as ethnically homogeneous. The *jus soli* bill introduced in November 2009, however, stipulated

⁵ Subjects of the former Ottoman Empire whose ethnic traits or specific locality qualified them for Greek nationality, but who never acquired it for any number of reasons (Christopoulos 2012).

⁶ Following the NATAC study (Bauböck *et al.* 2006), I use the term "nationality" rather than "citizenship" to denote the legal bond between a person and a state. I understand "citizenship" to refer to "the sum of legal rights and duties of individuals attached to nationality under domestic law" (Bauböck *et al.* 2006: 2).

nationality for documented immigrants⁷ children who were born or had received some schooling⁸ in Greece – crucially, in other words, it attempted for the first time in the history of the Greek nation-state to extend membership to people with no claims whatsoever to Greek ethnicity, but rather on the basis of the ties these people had developed to Greece via birth or socialization on its national soil. Given the tight normative correspondence between the ethnic and the political that had hitherto prevailed, the proposed law invited reactions that indicate that, for most Greeks, a change in nationality laws reflected more than a pragmatic response to two decades of unprecedented immigration and a second generation reaching majority. More than an extension of access to the rights and responsibilities that state membership confers, Greeks across various spectra of social, economic, and political beliefs and ideologies conceptualized the prospect of extending national membership to immigrants as change in the character of their society, and more specifically in the sociocultural norms that determine what kind of people may live next to each other and why. This conceptualization of the *jus soli* bill became evident to me not only through the words of national legislators like Polatidis and Dritsas, who spoke in their official capacity, but also through the words of journalists and public intellectuals expressing the views in the Greek press, and other Greeks who made a case for or against *jus soli* in online fora created for this purpose – in short, through a variety of publicly articulated views by different social actors who stepped up to argue on this highly contentious issue.

⁷ Originally, the bill stipulated that, for children to be eligible, only one parent need have documented status in Greece. Days before the bill was due for vote and in response to pressures from the political Right, the Socialists changed this to both parents.

⁸ Similarly, the bill originally stipulated having attended grades one through three in Greece. The new, stricter version changed this to a total of six years in the Greek school system.

“What is at stake here is the kind of society we want,” said far-Right deputy Thanos Plevris, addressing his colleagues during the three-day parliamentary debate that culminated in the bill being voted into law on March 11, 2010. “Do we want the national society as we have known it, whose dominant elements are the values and the principles of the Greek nation and the Greek culture, or do we want a multicultural society? Do we want, that is, an Athens where women will go around in *burkas*, where there will be mosques and huge minarets, where we’ll hear different languages being spoken? Or do we want a society, as we have known ours to be, with a sovereign nation based on history, on common customs and mores, on a common language, and on what Herodotus says – and which bothers you [i.e., his colleagues in the governing Socialist Party and the two parties of the Left with seats in the Greek Parliament] so much – on common blood?”

All the way across the (Greek) ideological spectrum, meanwhile, and in ardent support of the *jus soli* bill, sociologist and activist Miltos Pavlou also spoke in terms of the kind of society *jus soli* stood to produce. In a series of statements that appeared in newspapers who granted him editorial space as well as on the internet, Pavlou warned about the effects that the ongoing exclusion of immigrants and their offspring stood to have on Greek society. Such exclusion, Pavlou argued in a statement co-authored with fellow social scientist Anna Triandafyllidou and published on the website of the Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign Policy (ELIAMEP), stood to produce a body politic divided into two camps—those who enjoy full membership and those who are “helots and plebeians” (Pavlou and Triandafyllidou 2009), i.e., people who live and work in the country and yet are excluded from political membership, participation and decision-making mechanisms. In opinion pieces hosted in *Eleftherotypia* and *Kathimerini*

on December 2, 2009, and November 29, 2009 respectively, Pavlou emphatically rejected the notion of an ethnically homogeneous national society “as but a myth that has always consisted in an instrument of exclusion” (Pavlou 2009a, 2009b).

The diversity of perspectives on collective membership is precisely what attracted me to the topic of my dissertation research, i.e., how mass immigration interfaces with nationalist norms of collective belonging. For years before embarking on my research and while I lived in the United States, I had been following debates, mostly on Facebook, on issues related to Greece’s relationship with ethnic diversity and the country’s hegemonic⁹ narrative, which claims that the nation has been ethnically aware and homogeneous for millennia prior to achieving statehood. What intrigued me in these debates, apart from the mass participation that the new social media seemed to facilitate, was the articulation, alongside nationalist accounts, of discourses that challenged the country’s hegemonic narrative and offered alternative versions of events as well as different worldviews altogether. The issue that drew my attention the most was the name dispute with the neighboring Republic of Macedonia, which became a state in 1991, after Yugoslavia dissolved. Briefly, many Greeks raged against their new national neighbor’s choice of name, because the Greek official discourse has represented everything “Macedonian” as part of Greece’s ethno-cultural heritage (e.g., Triandafyllidou *et al.* 1997). On a state level, however, defining the issue as one of ethno-cultural usurpation has also consisted in an attempt to deflect attention from the existence of a Slavic-

⁹ I use *hegemonic* and *hegemony* throughout this dissertation in the Gramscian sense, to denote the mass internalization of the dominant group’s social norms, because of the latter’s socio-cultural prestige, which in turn stems from material supremacy (Hoare and Nowell Smith 1971: 12). Crucially, I do not think of hegemony as ever complete or all-encompassing – in other words, although hegemony is a function of mass consent rather than force, alternate social views always exist and vie to prevail.

speaking minority within Greece (Empeirikou and Skoulariki 2008), a minority the Greek state and its nationalist agents have consistently striven to assimilate or expel from the national realm altogether (Kostopoulos 2008). Chapter Two demonstrates that linguistic diversity and Slavic speakers have not been the only ethnic trait and ethnic minority respectively that the Greek state has tried to suppress in order to construct an ethnically homogeneous populace. The Greek state, similar to and perhaps to a greater extent than countless other modern states that embrace the nationalist principle, has been very diligent in rendering its population homogeneous and effective in representing it as even more so – suffice it to say that I, the child of highly educated, not nationalist parents, grew up a mere 200 miles from Slavic-speaking areas and yet had *never even heard* of these people’s existence in Greece, until 2001, when I was a sophomore at the University of Kansas, and witnessed an argument during an informal dinner gathering between another Greek student, who hailed from the Greek region of Macedonia, and a student from the Republic of Macedonia on whether a Slavic-speaking minority does, in fact, exist in Greece.

Yet mass immigration after the collapse of the Socialist Bloc and particularly neighboring Albania in 1991 has presented a much more formidable challenge to nation-state’s ethno-homogeneous myth. Immigrants’ widespread presence and mass visibility has sparked debates that have intensified and to some degree popularized the controversy between forces that try to cement Greece’s ethnic homogeneity and those who locate and wish to expose the cracks in that hegemonic imaginary. My dissertation, then, examines how immigration to a state that has consistently endeavored to eradicate ethnic diversity and normalize descent-based belonging has stirred polyvocal debates on who belongs in

the national community, and how these debates generate or reveal diverse conceptions of collective belonging. I must note that, for the purposes of such an inquiry, the timing of this *jus soli* bill was highly serendipitous. Introduced when I was about halfway into crafting my dissertation proposal, the bill brought the issue of immigrants' position vis-à-vis the collectivity to a head. The vehement debates it did indeed provoke do not reflect only responses to the proposed law. Greeks had been pondering their country's *de facto* pluralization since the beginning of mass immigration – yet many held on to the comfortable fantasy that newcomers would eventually return “home.” An overview of legislation passed to address mass migration since 1991 and until the 2009 *jus soli* bill reveals piecemeal measures that attempt to address short-term practical concerns, i.e., regulate flows and offer temporary documentation to the migrant work force, while shying from altering the criteria of belonging and thus departing from the nationalist model (Triandafyllidou 2009). The 2009 bill, however, stood to institutionalize this pluralization, officially turn it into a constitutive element of the Greek collectivity, and thus break the exclusive bond between body politic and ethnic group. As such, it represents a turning point in the history of Greece's experience with ethnic plurality, and has unleashed a flood of comments, positive and negative, from diverse actors and in a variety of media. Debates began to appear and then to rage across traditional outlets such as newspapers, television and radio as well as on new, social media such as Facebook. As I gathered and analyzed the data for patterns, I found the perspectives to be polyvocal, but not random nor infinite. That is, *systematic* observation and analysis for the purposes of my dissertation confirmed the impression of polyvocality I had formed through years of casually following debates in various fora. The perspectives articulated by the public

figures quoted above represent two widely divergent yet frequently articulated opinions. There are more.

As a Greek who takes strong issue with her country's nationalist views and practices, including, for example, the name dispute with neighboring Macedonia described above, or what Christopoulos aptly terms the "fetishism of descent" (2012: 168), I readily admit that I came to this subject out of personal as well as professional interest. In so doing I am not unique, for this combination has made me passionate about my research. My dissertation concentrates on what myriad Greeks' engagement with mass immigration can do to advance the understanding of collective belonging. The topic of the sociocultural reconfigurations that occur as a result of immigration has been highly theorized in recent decades, and yet there are still questions to be asked and answered. Most migration scholarship from the Chicago School to the present focuses not on the receiving country's identification(s)¹⁰, but on immigrants' identificational processes given the new context and transnational interaction with their homeland (*inter alia* Alba and Nee 1997; Glick-Schiller *et al.* 1992, 1995; Portes and Zhou 1993). Yet host societies also re-configure their self-understanding(s) in response to mass immigration. As Anna Triandafyllidou argues (2001), nations define and redefine themselves in response to "Significant Others" (2001: 32), i.e., collectivities geographically or culturally close to the nation, who come to share a "*close* relationship with the [ingroup's] sense of identity and uniqueness" (2001: 33, emphasis in the original) and at the same time "*represent what the ingroup is not*" (2001: 32, emphasis in

¹⁰ Following Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper (2000), I replace the term "identity" with "identification", a "processual, active term" (2000: 14) that "lacks the reifying connotations of 'identity'" (2000: 14; see also Jenkins 2008).

the original). Throughout its history, every nation redefines its imaginaries either to imitate or – more often – to demarcate itself from varying such Significant Others. Immigrants assume the role of a Significant Other, when any of their features (language, religion, phenotype, etc.) are seen as threatening to the nation’s (perceived) cultural purity. In response, Triandafyllidou concludes, the nation adopts a more exclusive self-definition and erects strong walls against unwanted newcomers.

Triandafyllidou’s focus on the element of interaction as crucial to processes of collective (re)-identification draws on the seminal work of Fredrick Barth (1969), which, along with more recent theoretical advances, forms the analytical approach to my study. I discuss this analytical framework in detail farther into this chapter. At this point and returning to Triandafyllidou, I must note that, in my reading of the literature, her work stands alone in taking as its central focus to produce theory that explains the effects of immigration on a host nation’s self-understanding. Yet, apart from the processes of symbolic closure that Triandafyllidou explicates, research is needed to examine the *range* of national re-conceptualizations that the presence of Significant Others triggers among different segments of the host community, hinging on the latter’s diverse “social location[s]” (Mahler and Pessar 2001: 445) – in other words, the multiple dimensions of identification, social contexts, and experiences that shape the ways in which people and act. Nations are not homogeneous, but plural (*inter alia* Bhabha 1990; Chatterjee 1993; Clifford 1994, 1997; Espiritu 1999; Gilroy 2004). Rather than a single imaginary, their members’ diverse social locations yield multiple conceptions of collective belonging, despite the best efforts of elites to promote ethnic homogeneity. Triandafyllidou’s model predicts that natives will exclude immigrant newcomers because the latter’s presence in

the national space challenges the normative categorization of people into nationals and non-nationals. Yet Triandafyllidou herself stresses that her model applies to a nationalist world, where hegemonic norms prescribe political and ethno-cultural correspondence (2001: ix). It does not predict the reactions of people who may have never embraced nationalist norms (Hobsbawm 1990), or people who possibly reconsider the nationalist model in response to the growing pluralization of their familiar environment (e.g., Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Trouillot 2003).

As discussed in detail in Chapter Two, a lot of people today may take the nation as “normal” or “natural,” but as recently as the 1870s, unifications in Italy and Germany produced very concerted efforts at creating Italians and Germans from much more diverse ethnic populations (e.g., Hobsbawm 1990). No less true is in the case of Greece, though its nation-building process began a few decades before Italy’s and Germany’s. Yet national projects are never fully successful in achieving sociocultural as well as political unity. Achieving ethno-cultural homogeneity has been the implicit, if not always explicit, goal of nation-state formation in the modern period (Gellner 1983; Hobsbawm 1990). Yet strenuous efforts to incorporate and normalize diverse elements have failed to erase existing cultural differences and stop the production of differentiation (Bhabha 1990). Even when suppressed or bypassed, alternative narratives of community have lingered on the fringes of the hegemonic imaginary (Chatterjee 1993). These marginalized narratives, which betray the cracks in a supposedly solid, uniform structure, become more dangerous to that fiction when new Others – immigrants – arrive en masse and re-pluralize the painstakingly homogenized national terrain (Bhabha 1990). Their transgression of the national space muddies the naturalized isomorphism between culture,

people and place (Appadurai 2003; Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Trouillot 2003). Although enormous scholarly effort has addressed migration and immigrants' integration into new societies, research is still needed to examine the *range* of voices – beyond just those that (re)produce hegemonic notions of ethnic homogeneity and seek to insulate the national community against the newcomers – that emerge and express their views in these debates, as immigration prompts natives to craft and contest national (re)imaginaries.

It is the aim of my dissertation to make such a contribution, and examine how immigration challenges the hegemonic, nationalist model of ethno-homogeneous belonging. Through its focus on natives' views of immigration, my project identifies the prospects for collective membership that emerge for immigrants in countries that do not envision themselves as “nations of immigrants,” and enhances knowledge on discourses and processes of inclusion and exclusion in a shifting socio-historical context. Further, my research identifies the potential of the nation-state to adjust to circumstances of increasing mobility and diversification. The socio-historical embeddedness of nationalism, the changes it has effected in conceptions of collective belonging and its possible fate within a shifting socio-historical context of growing mobility and diversification form the topic of the next chapter. It is important, however, to present my argument on the merits of the Greek case study, and why it can provide useful data for examination through the theoretical framework Chapter Two explicates.

III. THE GREEK CASE STUDY – WHY STUDY GREECE?

A traditional source of *emigration* until the early 1970s (Kasimis and Kassimi 2004), Greece has become home to a rising tide of immigrants since the collapse of the Communist Bloc, so many that its foreign-born population at the time of the discussions

examined in my dissertation – over 10 percent – was nearing that of well known countries of immigration such as the United States. Unlike most countries of Northern and Western Europe, who started receiving immigrants en masse, mostly foreign workers, in the 1960s, immigration to Greece did not emerge as a mass phenomenon until after the collapse of the Central and Eastern European regimes (Kasimis and Papadopoulos 2005). The 1991 population census registered the foreign born at 167,000, i.e., just over one percent of the population total (Kasimis and Kassimi 2004); by 2008, these figures had climbed to 1.3 million and 11.3 percent respectively (Triandafyllidou and Maroukis 2010). More than 70 percent of immigrants were of Albanian origin; other source countries include Bulgaria, Romania, former Soviet Republics and developing countries in Asia and Africa (Triandafyllidou and Maroukis 2010).

It must be noted that Greece was not the only European country to experience large-scale immigration in the past two to three decades. Spain and Italy experienced similarly new and mass flows around the same period (e.g., Triandafyllidou 2000). And immigration both into and around the European Union in the past five decades has triggered contentious debates and diverse sociocultural reconfigurations. In this sense, then, Greece's case is *not* unique, nor even especially noteworthy.

But the Greek case does merit examination for a number of reasons. First, because the debate I examine in my dissertation constitutes a distinct turning point in the nation's experience with ethnic plurality, in the sense that it marks the first time Greeks discussed – formally and publicly – the prospect of institutionally acknowledging this plurality as

an element of their national community¹¹. As such, it offers the researcher a valuable chance to witness and examine the ways in which a deep-seated, highly hegemonic ideological norm – that of political belonging on the basis of ethnic affinity – is dragged out of the “universe of the undiscussed” (Bourdieu 1994: 164), and becomes the object of public debate. All the more so because of another proposed change to the Greek nationality regime included in the *jus soli* bill, apart from extending political membership to people who were not born to Greek nationals – a change that, as Christopoulos (2012) argues, stood to deal perhaps as strong a blow to the primacy of ethnic descent and to the ideology of “Greek ethno-racialism” (Christopoulos 2012: 72) as *jus soli* in itself did. To wit, the bill stipulated – again for the first time in the history of Greek nationality law – that the Greek state would from then on be obligated to substantiate negative decisions to applications for nationality. The importance of this clause becomes evident, if seen in the context of the Greek state’s informal yet deliberate administrative practice of (1) rejecting the nationality applications of immigrants that met the criteria for naturalization but hailed from nations or ethnic groups deemed politically hostile to or ethno-culturally incompatible with Greece, and (2) applying *jus sanguinis* selectively by granting nationality only to those descendants of actual or potential Greek nationals who were deemed to belong to the Greek *genus* on the basis of their ethnic traits or national(ist)

¹¹ The debate I examine in my dissertation is a “turning point,” as I term it here, precisely because it constitutes the first time ethnic plurality and its relationship to the nation are discussed *formally* and *publicly* – and *not in any way* because post-1991 immigration consists in Greece’s first-ever experience with the mass advent of populations and significant ethnic difference. As a matter of fact, Greece has a history of comings and goings, and the nation’s proclaimed ethnic homogeneity is – to the degree that it exists – the product of protracted and deliberate processes of homogenization. Yet post-1991 immigration is represented, in the hegemonic discourse, but often also in social scientific and politically progressive accounts, as a first-time event and shock to the Greek public, politicians, and administrative mechanisms (Parsanoglou 2010). As Dimitris Parsanoglou (2010) argues, such representations stand to further normalize the narrative of ethnic homogeneity, and also provide an alibi to exclusionary attitudes, discourses, and policies (see also Christopoulos 2012: 199).

convictions (Christopoulos 2012). I discuss these topics in detail in Chapters Two, Five and Six¹²; here, I wish to highlight the fact that the *jus soli* bill and the conversations that accompanied its introduction and eventual passage dragged – for the first time in the Greek nation’s history – ethnic descent out of its shady command center and into the light not only of conceptual and discursive scrutiny, but also of a system of checks and balances.

Further, research that studies the range of reactions to the first-time prospect of formally including immigrants into the national community constitutes not only a necessary addition to scholarship on Greece, but also important material for comparison with other national cases. Discourses of exclusion and inclusion, particularly in the European arena, may be subject to a set of common influences, but also hinge greatly on regional, national, and local specificities (e.g., Goldberg 2006). An in-depth account of the discourses that emerged in Greece at this critical juncture provides the Greek piece of the puzzle that may be used in comparative inquiries. But my study’s findings stand to provide a basis for comparison not only with other European nations, but with national narratives in Greece itself after the country has experienced – and still is experiencing – the effects of its infamous debt crisis and the harsh neoliberal economic regime that followed (e.g., Streeck 2013). The debate I examine in my dissertation took place at the very outset of the debt crisis, when its effects were to a large degree still not evident. In

¹² Chapter Two examines the concept of belonging to the Greek *genus*, and demonstrates that it has historically hinged on a combination of ethnic traits and political beliefs and behaviors. Chapter Five provides a detailed account of the Greek state’s practices regarding the granting of nationality to descendants of actual or potential Greek nationals, particularly as they surfaced and were evaluated in the context of the *jus soli* conversation. Chapter Six discusses the clause of substantiating negative decisions and examines the diverse reactions it sparked among different people whose voices are “heard” in my dissertation.

the remainder of this section, I situate Greece in the broader European context, and argue for its explanatory potential within this context. I begin by providing a brief review of the way immigration since the 1960s has affected the sociocultural but also the legal norms of collective belonging in other European countries. The 1960s are not a random era; rather, they represent the point when many countries of Northern and Western Europe started receiving labor migrants (e.g., Koopmans *et al.* 2012). I pay particular, yet not exclusive, attention to the cases of France and Germany, showcased in the literature as the two ends on the continuum from flexible to rigid national boundaries and from a civic-political to an ethno-biological national imaginary (e.g., Brubaker 1990). Subsequently, I discuss the Greek case, and demonstrate that the debate I examine in my dissertation took place at a time when voices across the ideological spectrum – from the least to the most nationalist – had, for the first time in several decades, the same opportunity to speak and to be heard. Further, I give a brief summary of the very early stages of the infamous Greek crisis, which coincided with the *jus soli* debate. Both proponents and opponents of the proposed law, particularly parliamentarians, included Greece’s economic plight in their argumentation – and in very different ways, as may be expected. Yet I argue that, barring systematic investigation, which my dissertation does not include, the debt crisis may not be taken into account as a factor that affected how Greeks (re)defined their conceptions of collectivity.

The European Context

Not unlike Greece, the hegemonic narrative of most European nation-states that have experienced mass immigration since the 1960s did not represent these countries as “nations of immigrants,” but rather as ethno-culturally homogeneous. If legal norms of

national belonging reflect – as much as they condition – sociocultural ones (e.g., Christopoulos 2012; Tsitselikis 2006; Vogli 2008), then the fact that *jus sanguinis* was and remains, in most of these countries, the main mode of nationality acquisition a good half century after the beginning of mass immigration indicates the primacy of ethnic homogeneity in hegemonic national understandings. The exceptions are France and Britain, where *jus soli* historically has been on a normative par with *jus sanguinis*. Since 1889, the French state has granted automatic membership at majority to the second and at birth to the third generation of immigrants (Bertossi and Hajjat 2013; Brubaker 1990). This wide, ethnic-neutral inclusion into the French political community, however, has historically had as its basis the confidence as well as the expectation that that the passage of immigrants’ descendants through the state’s assimilatory institutions, such as the military and the school system will form them into citizens who embrace the mainstream sociocultural patterns (Brubaker 1990). In immigrant-receiving European states where *jus sanguinis* and some version of ethnic homogeneity are the norms, different modes of access to nationality on the basis of birth or socialization in the national territory have nevertheless granted nationality to immigrants’ descendants. The rules for the second and third generation in the Netherlands (Verkaaik 2010), Belgium (Foblets *et al.* 2013), and Sweden (Bernitz 2012), for example, are similar to those of France. *Jus sanguinis* is also the norm in the other two “new” countries of immigration, Spain and Italy – yet Italy offers second-generation immigrants nationality at majority (Zincone and Basili 2013), and in Spain third-generation immigrants enjoy birthright nationality (Martín-Pérez and Moreno-Fuentes 2012). It must be noted that another country whose nationality regime currently does not include any form of *jus soli* is Austria, where foreigners’ Austrian-

born children have nevertheless been *entitled* to naturalization (rather than be subject to the state's discretion, as "ordinary" naturalizations are) since 1998 (Stern and Valchars 2013). In Denmark, *jus soli* was the norm until 1976, and was gradually abolished by 2004. Yet about two-thirds of immigrants' descendants have been able to become nationals through regular naturalization channels; further, Denmark's center-Left government elected in 2011 is expected to introduce some form of access to nationality for people born or socialized in the country within 2014 (Ersbøll 2013). In short, even though with the exception of France and Britain the principle of descent reigns in most of Europe's immigrant-receiving nations, various forms of "conditional" (Honohan n.d.: 2) *jus soli* grant national membership to immigrants' descendants.

The two countries that are highlighted in the literature as almost ideal-typical nationality regimes on the basis of ethnic descent are Greece (e.g., Christopoulos 2012) and Germany (e.g., Koopmans and Ersanili 2010). Apart from mirroring Greece's ethno-biological idiom with blood-based conceptions of political belonging (e.g., Brubaker 1990), Germany's case is also seen as illustrative of the ways in which immigration compels a reconsideration of national understandings (Ehrkamp and Leitner 2003). Much like it occurred in Greece a decade later, as my dissertation demonstrates, the primacy of descent-based belonging in Germany was challenged during the 1990s by progressive politicians, the liberal media, and members of civil society, such as grassroots citizens' initiatives and various NGOs, while it remained "sacrosanct" (Ehrkamp and Leitner 2003: 132) for the conservative segment of the ideological spectrum. The electoral victory of the Social Democrats and the Greens in 1998 brought the issue to a head. The new government first disputed the forty-year-old claim that "Germany is NOT a country

of immigration” (Ehrkamp and Leitner 2003: 132) by acknowledging for the first time the millions of so called “guest workers” on German territory as permanent immigrants (Pautz 2005). Again much like the Greek turn of events, the center-Left’s *jus soli* bill met with a signature campaign by the conservatives and with enthusiastic approval by various civic organizations. The law that the Social Democrats and the Greens succeeded in passing in December 1999 offered nationality to children of at least one parent resident for eight years.

This law passed by a center-Left governing coalition, however, was qualified in 2004, when the Conservatives restricted membership to the descendants of those immigrants who possessed a settlement permit, i.e., a document that proves a higher degree of linguistic integration than ordinary documents; in 2007, they also strengthened integration requirements for the naturalization of first-generation immigrants (Hailbronner 2012). A few years earlier, in 1998, and in response to the center-Left’s nationality campaign, German conservatives had mounted a culturally essentialist discourse, which replaced notions of ethno-biological affinity by a notion of a “European *Leitkultur*” (Pautz 2005: 43), i.e., a set of core Enlightenment-based values that immigrants, and particularly Muslims, must embrace prior to membership in order to safeguard against the social fragmentation effected by the coexistence of people with fundamentally different sociocultural patterns.

Far from new, this discourse that replaces biology with essentialized, reified “culture” in order to effect the same, ethnically-exclusive boundaries has been articulated by the political Right in various European national contexts since the 1960s (e.g., Taguieff 2001). I discuss this discourse in detail in Chapter Four, where I demonstrate the

ways in which Greece's conservatives harnessed these notions to argue against the *jus soli* bill. What I wish to emphasize here is the fact that debates that redefine national boundaries in response to immigration, similar to the one I examine in my dissertation, have occurred before in several European national contexts, and produced a diversity of boundary-making schemes. Views on national membership in France in the 1980s and 1990s, for example, spanned the spectrum from the notion, articulated by the Left, that membership should not be predicated on assimilation and immigrants should be able to maintain their cultural patterns and still be members of the political community, to the far Right, which argued that assimilation was not possible (Brubaker 1990). Yet the expectation of cultural assimilation has become stronger and more explicit since the late 1990s and early 2000s. Immigrants' ethnic traits, and particularly traits associated to Islam, have been increasingly represented as the antithesis of the French secular identity, and laws passed in 2001 and 2011 have hardened naturalization requirements, introducing a test on the history and culture of France (Bertossi and Hajjat 2013; Bowen 2004; Keaton 2005). A similar turn to assimilation in the 2000s, complete with a view of Islam as foreign and dangerous, may be observed in the Netherlands, a state that in the 1980s and 1990s frowned upon notions of ethno-cultural assimilation. Since 9/11 and the 2002 and 2004 murders of far-Right politicians Pim Fortuyn and Theo van Gogh, membership has been increasingly grounded on the acceptance of values seen as quintessentially Dutch, such as gender equality and freedom of speech (e.g., Ghorashi 2010; Verkaaik 2010). Like the Netherlands, Denmark in the 2000s has placed emphasis on prospective members becoming the kind of persons who embrace liberal values, but are also familiar with the dominant ethnic idiom, prior to national membership (e.g.,

Mooritsen and Olsen 2011). A similar shift from a multiculturalist to an assimilationist understanding of becoming a national may be noted in Britain in the 2000s; examples include the introduction of a test that calls potential members to demonstrate that they know the British “way of life” (Swayer and Wray 2012; Andreouli and Howarth 2012).

To place my own investigation in context, then, I must note that many of the notions and discourses that emerged in the data I examined for my dissertation are not new, but rather have played out and often continue to do so in other European nations. My dissertation, however, does *not* provide an exhaustive comparison of debates in other European nations with the Greek one. Consequently, in the data chapters, which discuss how Greeks negotiated the principle of descent as well as other key nationalist notions, I do *not* make references to how conversations that took place in Greece are similar to different from analogous debates in other national contexts. In my concluding chapter, where I argue my findings’ academic and social significance, I do suggest some of the ways in which Greece informs the wider European experience with national (re)definition in response to immigration. Throughout my dissertation, however, I focus on how Greeks struggled with the notion of ethnic of descent and other key tenets of the nationalist ideology, as hegemonic norms were submitted to first-time public and comprehensive scrutiny. The Greek case may not new or original per se, but still constitutes a study that provides an exhaustive view into the *range* of publicly articulated voices that emerged to (re)affirm or challenge nationalist norms in response to immigration at a critical juncture in the country’s history.

One such relationship, which also jumps out through my study, is the link between people’s political and ideological orientations on one hand and conceptions of

collective belonging on the other. Research on the impact of political and ideological differences on immigration policy and nationality legislation has found that nationality legislation “fundamentally divides” (Akkerman 2012: 516) left and right-wing parties. More specifically, a clear divide is found to exist between the platforms and policies of the center Left, on one hand, and the center and extreme Right, on the other (*inter alia* Duncan and Van Hecke 2008; Givens and Luedtke 2005; Lahav 2004), whereas differences between the center and extreme Right are found to be more a matter of degree than fundamental ideological divergence (Bouillaud 2007). A glance at the recent history of nationality legislation of several European nations outlined above also confirms this relationship. In Germany, the center Left battled the center Right to institute *jus soli*, and the latter sought to qualify it when it regained power; in France and the Netherlands, center-Right cabinets (re)introduced notions of ethnic assimilation as a condition for membership; in Denmark, the center-Left government is expected to bring back some form of *jus soli*.

The Greek Case

What makes Greece stand out, along with Germany, among those European nations that have had to redefine their norms of collective belonging in response to immigration, is the almost archetypal normalization *and naturalization* of the nationalist principle in the country’s hegemonic national discourses. Almost since its inception in 1830, the Greek state has engaged in a series of purification campaigns to achieve an ethnically homogeneous populace (*inter alia* Kitromilidis 1989; Karakasidou 1997; Kostopoulos 2008, 2010; Margaritis 2005; Tsitselikis 2006). *Political* belonging has hinged on membership in the Greek *ethnic* group, membership hegemonically

conceptualized, represented and until very recently mostly enforced as *biological (inter alia* Triandafyllidou 2001; Tsitselikis 2006; Tzanelli 2002, 2006). The conceptual compression of all these layers of collective belonging makes the analytical task of pulling them apart fascinating.

Further, the introduction and subsequent passage of the *jus soli* bill represents, in my interpretation, the strongest victory to date – albeit short-lived, as I discuss below – by social forces that had been trying, at least since the 1980s, to challenge the hegemony of official, nationalist views and practices, expose their socially adverse effects, and advance a counter-hegemonic worldview and socially organizing scheme(s). A minute historical review and causal analysis of this power struggle during these past few decades as well as earlier is beyond the scope of my study. I am nevertheless in a position to name key events that, put together in a loose chronology, suggest that groups and actors critical of Greek nationalism have acquired greater leeway, visibility and legitimacy, forming by the 2000s a reckonable counter-hegemonic pole.

To wit, until the mid-1970s and arguably since the 1920s¹³ (Panourgia 2009), the ideological idiom that reigned in Greece was *ethnikofrosyni*, i.e., national mindedness, which persecuted and excluded from the national corps leftists and people with non-Greek ethnic traits. Effectively, *ethnikofrosyni* restricted full membership in the collectivity and access to its resources to Greek-speaking, Christian nationalists (e.g., Panourgia 2009). The 1974 restoration of democracy followed by the Socialists' first

¹³ Although it intensified after Greece's 1946-1949 Civil War and the defeat of the leftist Democratic Army of Greece (DSE), *ethnikofrosyni* was nevertheless operative since at least the 1920s. Laws passed in the 1920s punished the acknowledgment of ethnic cleavages in the body politic (*Katochyrotikon*) and subversive, i.e., Communist, ideas (*Idionymon*) (e.g., Mavrogordatos 1983; Panourgia 2009).

electoral victory in 1981 restored leftists into the national community¹⁴, but did little for members of ethnic minorities, who had either been deprived of nationality and subsequently the right to reside in Greece (Anagnostou 2005), or remained subject to severe (semi-)official repression (Anagnostou 2005; Kostopoulos 2008, 2010). Things started changing for them in the 1990s. A major turning point is the abolition, in 1998, of the infamous Article 19 of the Greek Nationality Code, which, since 1955, had served to deprive some 50,000 Muslims of their Greek nationality (Anagnostou 2005). A corresponding shift is evident in Greek academic knowledge production and particularly in its public expressions. Indicatively, I mention a state-published history book, written by a team of Greek academics and intended for the sixth-grade national curriculum – a book that radically challenged several foundational elements of the Greek nationalist narrative¹⁵ (Özkimirli and Sofos 2008).

These two examples of counter-hegemonic ideas and practices, however, do not indicate that nationalist forces have subsided or not fought back. The abolition of Article 19 met with fierce resistance from the political Right, and the then-ruling Socialists also stopped short of granting the Muslims' request for recognition as a Turkish, national minority (Anagnostou 2005). The new history book was withdrawn in 2007, a year after it was presented to the public, following fierce mobilizations (Papachelas 2007). It does

¹⁴ The center-Right government that succeeded the *junta* in 1974 legalized the Communist Party, and the Socialists later allowed the repatriation of DSE fighters who had taken refuge in Communist countries – yet only ethnic Greek ones (e.g., Empeirikou and Skoulariki 2008; Panourgia 2009).

¹⁵ Specifically, the book stressed the Greek nation's historical novelty, represented the 1922 flight of Asia Minor, Greek-speaking Christians from neo-Turkish forces – an event that has acquired huge symbolic significance in the hegemonic Greek imaginary – in a way that was accused of undermining the traumatic element of this experience, and challenged the hegemonic representation of the Orthodox Church as a national force, by pointing out the ambivalence of members of the clergy vis-à-vis the Greek struggle for national statehood and the church's ecumenical, rather than national, orientation (Özkimirli and Sofos 2008).

indicate, however, that by the time the *jus soli* bill was proposed, the climate was such that, arguably for the first time in the history of modern Greece, a *variety* of voices had come to enjoy, if not comparable degrees of legitimacy, then at least the ability to publicly speak and to be heard.

The predominance of forces that sought to break with the nationalist narrative, as well as the discursive climate this predominance enabled ended in July 2012, when the main party of the political Right came into power once more. The law granting nationality to the second generation did, indeed, pass in March 2010, supported by the governing Socialists, as well by the two parties of the Left represented in the National Assembly, the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) and the Coalition of the Radical Left (SYRIZA). While strongly critical of the fact that the bill limited nationality to children of documented parents, thus excluding a large segment of the second generation, the two parties of the Left nevertheless backed the initiative. Center-Right New Democracy (ND) and the far-Right Popular Orthodox Alarm (LAOS) opposed it staunchly – what is more, ND leader Antonis Samaras vouched repeatedly that his party would annul the law, when it came into power.

Table 1-1 Political Parties' Positions toward the *Jus Soli* Bill¹⁶

	PASOK (ruling Socialists)	ND (center Right)	KKE (Communist Party)	LAOS (far Right)	SYRIZA (Coalition of the Radical Left)
Position toward <i>jus soli</i>	For	Against	For	Against	For
What members of the second or one-and-a- half generation should be eligible for membership?	Children born or schooled in Greece, whose parents are <i>documented</i> immigrants. Membership conferred at birth or upon completion of six years of schooling.	Adult members of the second generation, born in Greece to <i>documented</i> parents and having attended all nine years of compulsory education in Greece. Membership conferred at majority.	All members of the second or one-and-a- half generation, irrespective of parents' documentation status. Membership conferred at majority.	None	All members of the second and one- and-a-half generation, irrespective of parents' documentati on status.

Indeed, Samaras' party was re-elected in July 2012 as the head of a coalition government supposed to manage the vicious debt crisis that had been tormenting the country and its citizens since early 2010. I discuss the crisis in detail farther into this section, particularly since its outset coincided with the debate on the *jus soli* bill examined in my dissertation. Going back to the law's annulment, however, a claim was

¹⁶ Parties are listed in the order of the number of seats they held in the Greek Parliament at the time of the *jus soli* debate.

filed to the Council of State in August 2010 by a Greek citizen¹⁷, contesting the law's constitutionality. In March 2011, the council's 4th Chamber announced its ruling for the plaintiff, and the issue was referred to the council's Plenary Session for a final, binding decision. In its turn, the Plenary Session published its final ruling on February 5, 2013 (Karamanoli 2013). The gist of the majority decision was as follows: While legislators may, according to the particular conjuncture, make the criteria for nationality acquisition more lax or stricter, they may nevertheless "not disregard the fact that the Greek state was established and exists as a national state with a particular history" (Council of State 2013). Consequently, the majority decision argued, the minimum requirement for nationality acquisition consists in "the existence of a true bond between the alien and the Greek state and society, which are not invertebrate organisms and temporary creations, but represent a timeless unity with a particular cultural background, a community with relatively constant customs and mores, a common language with a long tradition [...]" (Council of State 2013). What becomes evident, particularly after one has read my dissertation, is that the majority decision's rationale – and largely even its phrasing – is almost identical, in several aspects, to the arguments put forward in the political debate by Samaras and other members of his New Democracy party. A minority of 13 judges ruled that "a true bond" to the Greek nation should not be a precondition for membership, as the naturalized immigrant joins the political, rather than the ethno-national, community (Council of State 2013).

¹⁷ The plaintiff against 3838/2010, lawyer Ioannis Andriopoulos, has since been taken on as a paid consultant by a national representative from the ranks of Greece's neo-Nazi Golden Dawn party (*Eleftherotypia* 2013).

As soon as the council's decision was made public, Samaras' government announced its plans for a stricter nationality regime that will condition nationality upon cultural assimilation, and will grant it to members of the second generation at majority, rather than birth, provided also that they have acquired a junior high school diploma. Further, the new regime will treat the granting of nationality not as the right of people who have developed certain ties to Greece, but as something that relies on the state's discretionary power (Papagiannis 2013). The bill was scheduled to be presented to the National Assembly for deliberation in September 2013 (Avgi 2013a), but to date it has not yet been released.

Yet, as grim as the present situation appears, the fact that the law passed when it did indicates that alternative conceptions of collective belonging do exist and do vie for legitimacy – if the political balance of power shifts, they may very well prevail again. Politicians from parties of the Left and the formerly ruling Socialists, Greek and immigrant activists, public intellectuals and prominent NGOs, such as the National Commission for Human Rights, who had thrown their weight behind *jus soli*, are speaking out in numerous ways against the prospect of a more restrictive nationality regime (Avgi 2013b). This is precisely what my dissertation captures – a socio-historical instance when all voices across the ideological spectrum had the opportunity to speak and to be heard in the public arena. Given my study's objective to capture the multiplicity of conceptions on collective belonging, Greece at this socio-historical juncture offered a wealth of data to be mined.

The Crisis Context

Before closing the section on the merits of the Greek case study, it is important to devote some discussion to the now-infamous Greek debt crisis, if only because of its temporal correspondence with the topic of my dissertation. I must note, however, that my study does *not* examine the potential relationship between Greeks' budding awareness of their economic plight and their conceptions of collective membership. Glimpses of such a relationship appear in conversations that negotiate the effects of immigrant inclusion – or exclusion – on the nation's resources, presented in Chapter Six. Barring systematic investigation, however, I refrain from drawing theoretical conclusions. I particularly refrain from assuming that the prospect of an economic downturn led some people to tighten the nation's boundaries vis-à-vis immigrants more than they would otherwise¹⁸. Positing a causal relationship between economic adversity and xenophobia amounts, in my view, to “methodological nationalism” (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller 2002), in the sense that it assumes that people will tighten collective boundaries along ethno-national rather than, say, class lines – it reproduces, in other words, the nationalist assumption that ethnicity represents the primary dimension of people's identification.

The country's severe economic predicament started becoming evident around the same time that the bill was being debated. Just days before Greece's lawmakers were called to vote on the *jus soli* bill, the ruling Socialists had introduced, on March 5, 2010, the crisis' first major austerity package (after a much milder one the previous month),

¹⁸ It is true that the increasingly deepening crisis pushed some half million Greeks to vote, in June 2012, for the violently anti-immigrant, neo-Nazi Golden Dawn party, ushering it from the murkiest political margins all the way into the spotlight of the National Assembly. Yet this may very well reflect the neo-Nazis' fervent rhetoric against the corruption and clientelism of mainstream politicians rather than their extreme, anti-immigrant nationalism. Further, this occurred two years after the bill's passage, when the effects of the crisis on the life conditions and chances of many Greeks had become much more painfully evident.

including, among other measures, sizeable tax increases and a seven percent cut in the salaries of public and private employees (Kostarelou 2010; Melander 2010). The local version of the global economic downturn had become evident earlier; the Greek economy had been slowing down since 2005 and entered into a recession in 2009 (INE 2009). Yet official discourses represented the situation as manageable and reversible. Notably, the Socialist Prime Minister, who personally and fervently championed the *jus soli* bill, was able to run and win in October 2009 on the slogan – since widely and bitterly ridiculed – that “Money Is There” [Λεφτά Υπάρχουν]; it just needs to be redistributed. Introduced in late November 2009, the *jus soli* bill passed on March 11, 2010. During these months and after revealing that the country’s 2009 budget deficit was about double the previously announced figure, the newly elected Socialists were ostensibly still striving to come up with a budget that would keep the country solvent (Reuters 2010). The austerity measures passed on March 5 represent precisely this effort.

Data for my study, then, consist in views expressed at the onset of mass crisis awareness, and represent this early transitional stage. In the early months of 2010, Greece had yet to enter any of the lending agreements that stipulated the implementation of even harsher austerity measures¹⁹, and the effects of these economic policies of austerity were yet to become evident. Because it captures discourses on collective membership articulated during this early stage, my study offers a valuable basis for comparison for research that may use Greece as a case study to examine the effects of harsh austerity on national boundaries.

¹⁹ Greece entered its first bailout agreement with the European Union and the International Monetary Fund in May 2010, followed two months later by a pension reform law slashing benefits and raising the retirement age (Telegraph 2011).

Crisis context aside, the discussion in this section has demonstrated that Greece is an excellent optic through which to examine whether and how people (re)negotiate the hegemonic, nationalist model of collective belonging in the face of mass immigration. Moreover and as I argue in the next section, seeing nationalism through the theoretical lens of “boundary work” (Gieryn 1983; Lamont and Mólнар 2002) enhances the important and extensive work produced by myriad scholars of nationalism over recent decades. That is, my dissertation will *not* use boundary work in opposition to the advances in this area made by other scholars. Rather, I will show how the boundary work lens aids in clarifying my analysis – much like a good analytical lens should.

IV. ANALYTICAL LENS: BOUNDARIES AND POWER

While Chapter Two explicates the theoretical approaches that inform my study, here I discuss a theoretical body that serves as an analytical lens for my dissertation; in other words, that determines how I conceptualize the different voices I “hear” throughout this research and which seek to define the criteria for collective membership. The introduction to this chapter cited public figures who deployed different markers to define the collectivity’s boundaries. Following the approach I explicate in this section, I conceptualize their discursive schemes as instances of “boundary work” (Gieryn 1983: 781). This approach shows how people, despite their distribution across different power-knowledge continua or what others call their “social location[s]” (Mahler and Pessar 2001: 445), nonetheless actively engage in power-laden processes of creating, altering, enforcing and redrawing the sociocultural as well as political boundaries of nations.

Boundary work is continual and occurs in everyday, practical settings (Gieryn 1983). In her recent work on the ways in which humans acquire, normalize and possibly

redefine their cognitive and behavioral (sociocultural) patterns, Sarah Mahler (2012) reviews the recent advances in the area of understanding brain-culture connections from myriad fields including neuroscience, psychology, sociology, and anthropology, and demonstrates that creating categories of social organization is an inherent part of the human condition. Humans are mentally hardwired to form social categories (Fiske 2004), in order to make sense of the social world and render it predictable (Hale 2004; Mahler 2012; Sibley 1995). As Mahler (2012) argues, humans learn very early that the social world is patterned, acquire the patterns operative in the social environment, and enforce, maintain them, change them or form new patterns later in life in response to shifting social contexts. Young children, for whom the social world is a mystery, engage in detecting patterns very early and apply them with a vengeance, because they make their social environment more understandable and predictable (Mahler 2012).

The fact however that we think in categorical terms does not mean that the categories we identify are *natural* or *normal*. This becomes particularly evident by observing how children *learn* social categories, largely because these are already operative in their social environment. Mahler (2012), whose new work conceptualizes culture as the *process* of learning the cognitive and behavioral patterns of people who surround us rather than a thing that individuals or groups somehow *a priori* possess, gives a telling example. Preschoolers in a multicultural environment were engaged in activities that drew attention to their racial differences, in order to become more aware and tolerant. In the context of these activities, they were shown a book with photographs of children of various different phenotypes. The teacher then asked each child to select a picture that looked most like him or herself. One light-skinned boy found his likeness in a

photo of a dark-skinned girl who was wearing a red robe – as it turned out, this was because he was also wearing a red shirt at the moment. In other words, what he saw as common was clothing, not sex or skin color. Yet the teacher interfered with his spontaneous categorizing, and redirected him to identify with someone of his own sex and skin color instead – in other words, taught him to privilege sex and skin color as markers of commonality.

Boundary work, then, consists in the attribution of selected features to groups or entities in order to demarcate them (Gieryn 1983). Crucially, however, this does not mean that the groups or entities in question feature a core or essential nature – essentializing arbitrary traits, however, succeeds in making boundaries and categories appear natural and thus harder to abolish (Gieryn 1983). As Mahler (2012) carefully argues, and her example re-narrated above explicates, the classificatory patterns we learn and enforce and the markers we deploy to define them are not natural, universal, or fixed, but rather hinge on and reflect socially constructed distinctions.

Long before recent advances explained the brain processes which prompt it to occur, the concept and mechanics of boundary work originated in the theoretical framework developed by Fredrick Barth (1969), who argued that collectivity does not stem from a group's cultural content, but rather from the process of making, maintaining, re-negotiating and crossing boundaries with other groups. To produce and sustain the boundary, social actors deploy cultural features to accentuate similarity and difference. The choice of specific cultural features hinges on socio-historical circumstances rather than on the features' actual salience to the group's self-definition (Barth 1969).

Boundaries, however, do not create social distinctions simply in order to facilitate social organization. An element that is not emphasized in Barth's work is power and the role of boundaries in producing and maintaining an unequal distribution of resources. Thomas Gieryn (1983) argues that a key goal of boundary work is to enlarge a group's relative resources. Similarly, Pierre Bourdieu (1994) posits the political function of classificatory schemes; boundaries emerge from power relations and their function is to reproduce them. According to Douglas Massey (2007), classification is the first step to stratification, i.e., the unequal distribution of people across social categories with differential access to material, symbolic or emotional resources.

The role of power in boundary-making processes is made explicit in works that negotiate the relationship between basic human processes of classification and the way some conceptual categories are normalized and graduate into objectified distinctions that organize social reality. Going back to Massey (2007), stratification varies with the degree of occupational differentiation and population density, but its fundamental mechanisms are the same across socio-historical contexts. Group formation and demarcation are followed by the institutionalization of practices that allocate resources unequally among social categories (Massey (2007)).

Stratification, then, begins with classification. Before inequality may be implemented socially, cognitive categories must be created to classify people conceptually according to achieved and ascribed traits. But classification is a basic human process – everyone engages in it. Everyone creates conceptual patterns to understand and interpret the social environment. And all social actors strive to normalize the version of social reality most favorable to them. Success depends on power – social

actors who control the most resources have the upper hand in establishing classificatory schemes (Massey 2007).

Michèle Lamont and Virág Molnár (2002) forge a similar argument, when they distinguish between symbolic and social boundaries. The former consist in “conceptual distinctions made by social actors to categorize objects, people, practices and even time and space; [...] tools by which individuals and groups struggle over and come to agree upon definitions of reality” (2002: 168). People forge symbolic boundaries to acquire status and monopolize resources. But symbolic boundaries wield limited power until certain social actors manage to force or convince most individuals and groups in a social configuration to accept certain boundaries as valid definitions of social reality. At this point, these symbolic boundaries become social, i.e., “objectified forms of social differences manifested in unequal access to and unequal distribution of resources (material and non-material) and social opportunity” (Lamont and Molnár 2002).

This is not to say that subordinate groups in any social order do not contest the status quo or struggle to establish boundaries that facilitate their access to resources. The most powerful social actors may very well have the upper hand; yet power generates resistance (Massey 2007), and boundaries are “ambiguous, flexible, historically changing, contextually variable, internally inconsistent and sometimes disputed” (Gieryn 1983: 792). Within the nation, this translates into diverse and often clashing efforts by different social forces to define the nation and appropriate the national discourse (e.g., Özkimirlı and Sofos 2008) – or, to use the conceptual terms that correspond to my study’s analytical lens which has now been introduced, forces who use different markers to define collective boundaries in ways that render them more or less fluid and

permeable. The remainder of my dissertation frames the topic through the lens of boundary work. The introduction of the *jus soli* bill prompted discussions that demonstrated that Greeks privileged diverse markers – e.g., civic virtues as opposed to ethnic descent – whose application stood to produce significantly different collective boundaries. As a Greek, I also hold firm notions on who should be included in the national community and why. It is important, therefore, to discuss the ways in which I have tried to ensure that my perspective does not skew the results of my inquiry.

V. MY OWN PERSPECTIVE

As I discuss in the “Research Problem” section of this chapter, my approach to the study of nationalism is socially and personally motivated to a significant degree. Underlying my scholarship is a normative conception of nationalism as a reactionary ideology that prescribes a view of humanity as naturally divided in distinct, bounded, culture-containing units, and thus erects rigid social boundaries and promotes intolerance and historical short-sightedness. My perspective becomes even more “partial” (Haraway 1988: 583) as a result of my membership in the group under study. As a Greek, I am, and have been throughout my life, deeply embedded in the processes of defining the nation’s character and boundaries.

Recognizing and disclosing the partiality of my perspective is the first step to attaining some measure of objectivity, to the degree that objectivity is possible in the social sciences (Haraway 1988). Further, I draw on Corbin and Strauss (1998), who define objectivity as “the ability to achieve a certain degree of distance from the research materials and to represent them fairly; the ability to listen to the words of respondents and to give them a voice independent of that of the researcher” (1998: 35). In my

interpretation, this translates into a critical view of *all* discourses – including those with which I agree and regard as socially emancipatory in their basic intentions – as ideologically driven, boundary-making processes embedded in power relations, and aiming to (re)produce different social hierarchies. Consequently, I have sought to apply the same mixture of empathy and critique to all the voices I have “heard” in the course of this research.

Voices that compete with each other to narrate the nation, and define its boundaries with significantly different markers figure in Chapters Four, Five and Six of my dissertation. Chapter Two, which precedes them, discusses the main theoretical approaches to nationalism, situates my study within them, and expands the argument, stated briefly here, that changing socio-historical conditions dictate a re-examination of the sway that nationalism holds over people – all the while questioning whether it ever truly did. Further and applying the boundary work framework discussed earlier in this chapter, Chapter Two conceptualizes nationalism as a boundary-making scheme, and examines its historical trajectory in the Greek context in terms of changing markers employed to construct collective boundaries as increasingly less mutable, fluid and permeable. Drawing on the historical and ethnographic record, I argue that what sets nationalism apart from other schemes of social organization is its unyielding essentialism; even when it grounds belonging on cultural, rather than biological, commonality, it still represents national culture as thing-like and immutable and demands its complete adoption. Chapter Three discusses the research process. Specifically, it explicates the rationale that guided data collection, describes the analytical methodology and process, and includes a list of my study’s key conceptual findings. Chapters Four,

Five, and Six are the data chapters, which present my study's main findings. Chapter Seven concludes my study by briefly highlighting the connections, drawn throughout my dissertation, between conceptions of collective belonging and other social beliefs and orientations. A further conceptual untangling of the ties between nationalism and other social ideologies, particularly in the ongoing crisis context, is suggested as a direction for future research.

Chapter 2: Nationalism and Ethnicity, and the Greek Nation-Building Process

I. INTRODUCTION

Drawing from recent advances in fields that research brain-culture connections, the previous chapter argued that humans are hardwired to see, create, and enforce patterns in their social environment (e.g., Massey 2007; for a comprehensive review and synthesis of these scientific advances see Mahler 2012). In other words, humans create conceptual categories that render their social environment orderly and predictable – not least, categories of people who *belong together* on the basis of certain shared attributes. Crucially, however, the choice of traits used to determine sameness or difference and therefore bind people together and demarcate them from others does *not* reflect commonality or affinity that is in any way natural or normal, but rather consists in the ever-changing outcome of power-laden social processes (e.g., Lamont and Molnar 2002). As Chapter One explicates, social actors seek to promote, normalize and often naturalize the socially organizing schemes that afford them the greatest access to access to material, symbolic or emotional resources (e.g., Bourdieu 1994; Massey 2007).

A key task of social scientists, then, consists in the critical examination of concepts and categories utilized to comprehend human existence. In his swan song, seminal anthropologist Michel-Rolph Trouillot (2003) urged his colleagues to problematize hegemonic concepts which were institutionalized in the nineteenth century of various interrelated *isms* (colonialism, positivism, nationalism, etc.) and which hide their socio-historical contingency under a cloak of universality in order to prescribe, rather than simply describe, the world (2003: 84-86). The naturalization of the nation-state ranks among “the most powerful and pervasive fictions of modernity” (2003: 84),

yet it is challenged daily, as increased cross-border mobility and the resulting diversification of previously homogenized national units contests the normativity of rooted, ethno-homogeneous belonging. The increase in cross-border flows and contact since the late 1960s engenders *both* nationalist fervor in response to the intrusion of ethno-national difference, as well as counter-hegemonic notions of collectivity (*inter alia* Appadurai 1993, 1996; Cresswell 2006; Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Malkki 1992; Trouillot 2003).

Nationalism and its discontents, then, must be examined carefully and critically. This is precisely my objective in this chapter. In Section II, I discuss and critique the work of scholars who have defined nations and nationalism. To anticipate, I situate my scholarship within the constructivist camp; I adopt the view of the nation as a social form that arises at a particular point in human history and in response to specific conditions, and I define nationalism as the socio-historically embedded ideological principle that the political and the ethno-cultural units must coincide (Gellner 1983; Hobsbawm 1990). In Section III and using Greece as my case study, I examine how, why and to which degree people have internalized and naturalized this principle since it arose in the late eighteenth century and the way nationalism has superimposed on and disrupted previous patterns of collective organization. Among other things, this discussion also makes a case for the scholarly but also social significance of my study. An in-depth review of the historical and ethnographic record demonstrates that the advent of nationalist views and practices disrupted previously fluid patterns of social exchange and interaction in the Balkan Peninsula and reified multiple social boundaries that people used to cross with relative ease (e.g., Karakasidou 1997). In the region's new national entities, people who would

not, for various reasons, conform to the dominant ethno-national idiom were deemed aberrant and dangerous, and were subject to expulsion or various processes of forceful assimilation. Yet the reappearance, en masse, of ethnic difference in the national context in the late twentieth century has faced Greek nationalism with very similar dilemmas. Throughout the twentieth century, in the heyday of nationalist fervor and post-war reconfigurations of political and sociocultural lines of belonging, Greece strove and largely managed to banish or quash ethnic differences. Under the bright light of 21st century subjectivities, however, this option is more difficult. Thus, Greece is an exemplary case through which to examine how the painstakingly constructed nationalist model of social organization fares in circumstances of increasing mobility and diversification. I turn to this now.

II. THE ORIGINS OF THE NATION AS A SOCIAL FORM

Literature that examines the genesis and character of nations and nationalism currently divides into two broad camps: the view of the nation as a product of socio-historical processes versus theories assigning causal primacy to ethnic ties. The first camp finds key expression in the classic works of Benedict Anderson (1983), Ernest Gellner (1983), and Eric Hobsbawm (1990), who theorize the nation as an elite-forged response to the novel socioeconomic processes of modernity. On the antipode and in critique of the former, Anthony D. Smith (1998, 2008) and John Hutchinson (2005) posit the recurrent surfacing of national formations since the advent of literacy, and assign causal primacy for the formation of nations to ethnicity. To anticipate, I situate myself within the first camp and conceptualize the second as an essentialist body of theories that are actually a part of the nationalist ideology (see also Özkimirli 2003). In the coming

subsections, I briefly discuss major theorists from the first camp before shifting to the second.

The Nation as Social Form Emerging with Modernity

The Theorists

Here, I discuss how Gellner, Hobsbawm, and Anderson answer the “when,” “where,” and “why” of the nation and nationalism, as well as their predictions for how this social form and the ideology that bolsters it will fare when the socio-historical conditions that helped spawn them are no longer operative.

For Gellner, nations arise when cultural homogeneity becomes vital to the function of modern, industrial societies – they do not consist in a natural or universal form of social organization or the awakening of old, dormant “cultures”. The industrial era’s need for mass literacy, standardized knowledge and context-free communication, i.e., communication in a shared linguistic and cultural idiom, spawns and normalizes nationalism, i.e., the view that the political and ethno-cultural units must coincide. Nationalism, in turn, engenders nations, i.e., culturally-homogeneous populations whose members recognize each other as such. The “cultures” that nationalism claims to revive, then, are in reality its own inventions; while nationalism employs existing cultural elements, it does so selectively as well as transforms them in the process.

Gellner stresses that nations are not caused by pre-existing sentiments of groupness and belonging – nationalism, in his view, is not a movement that deplores the statelessness and strives for the political realization of a cultural community. Rather, Gellner argues, nationalism and nations emerge within the context of existing polities and their response to the needs of the industrial era. The need for context-free communication

compels the emerging state to cultivate linguistic and cultural homogeneity throughout its territory by means of a mass, public education system. People, in response, identify with this new, presumably homogenous “culture,” because, when context-free communication becomes the essence of social life, the “culture” to which one has been taught to identify with and communicate through becomes the core dimension of identification.

Meanwhile, despite state-directed practices of ethno-cultural homogenization, some groups do not fit, do not want to fit or have traits or practices that prevent them from blending seamlessly into the social mainstream and reaping its material benefits. In return, Gellner argues, they attempt to form their own purportedly homogenous political units. In these cases, Gellner sees nationalism as developing at the intersection of ethno-linguistic ties and material discontent. Groups marginalized in the course of nation-building processes do not reject nations and nationalism per se; on the contrary, they embrace the principle and develop their own national projects.

While the nation emerges out of the needs of the industrial era, Gellner argues, it will not wane post-industrially. A wave of new formations is unlikely, but the “infrastructural investment” (1983: 122) in an international system will serve to perpetuate existing national configurations. Nationalism will persist, then, albeit “in a muted, less virulent form” (1983: 122).

Much like Gellner, Hobsbawm argues that the nation, rather than immemorial, rooted on ethnic ties or produced by processes recurring throughout human history, is firmly embedded in a specific stage of technological and economic development, and constitutes a social entity only if attached to a modern, territorial state. Attempts to define the nation, he argues, using “objective” criteria, e.g. language, ethnicity, culture, etc., are

intellectually as well as politically dubious – they squeeze a contingent structure into an ill-fitting frame of universality and foster chauvinism and exclusion.

Hobsbawm situates the birth of nations in a specific socio-historical context, when territorial states become the basis for economic development after the 16th century. Consequently, nation-building depends on the viability of the potential nation as a unit of economic development, rather than on any sort of ethnic ties. Thinkers of the era, according to Hobsbawm, view the nation as one stage in a process of social evolution that expands the scale of human social units from the family to, eventually, the global. National movements aim to enlarge territorial and administrative units rather than to gather co-ethnics under the same, exclusive political tent. Linguistic and cultural homogenization and the eradication of “smaller” “cultures” and languages are seen by these thinkers as the by-product – even regrettable – of social evolution, not as inherent to or causal of national formation. When they do not interfere with the predominant language and nationality, they are allowed to exist and even cherished.

Nationalism’s mutation in the 1880s into the ideological principle that the political and the ethno-linguistic units must coincide reflects the modern state’s administrative needs and middle-class struggles over power, status and resources, rather than a rising awareness of age-old affective ties. Emotive symbols and traditions hailing an elite-invented national past serve to enforce linguistic homogeneity and harness the loyalty of subjects-turned-citizens. Meanwhile, the middle strata’s prospects for economic advancement hinge on their appropriating the new official “national” vernacular. The fact that they become energetic nationalists betrays their tentative socioeconomic moorings. They endorse these new nationalist criteria as markers of their

belonging to the nation and, *ipso facto*, their superiority vis-à-vis a host of national Others – workers, capitalists, immigrants, leftists, foreign states, etc. New means of mass communication diffuse nationalist ideologies and symbols to the population at large.

For Hobsbawm, national sentiment continues to derive from class in the post-WWI, anti-fascist period – yet now it merges with international, leftist struggles for social transformation. Because these struggles tackle domestic issues as well, they acquire a national character. The mid-century anti-colonial and anti-Nazi struggles bolster this union. Yet Hobsbawm takes care to note that post-colonial movements and states, unlike their predecessors, do *not* emerge from nationalism. In contradistinction to nationalist goals, their goal is not to merge the ethno-cultural with the political, but, rather, to overthrow oppression and compete for resources. Nations and nationalism, for Hobsbawm, do not extend outside their region and era of origin. Situated “between two essentially transnational eras” (1990: 25), the nation is losing its salience, all the more so since the territorially-bounded national economy no longer forms the building block of the world economy.

Anderson is the third key theorist discussed here who has examined nationalism from a social constructivist, or modernist, perspective. His views differ, however, from those of Gellner and Hobsbawm. Anderson holds that, while the nation *does* stem from specific economic and technological developments occurring at particular times and places, it is nevertheless flexible enough to be transplanted into an array of socio-historic terrains and merge with various political and ideological forms. Rather than a mere by-product of the modern state, nationalism, Anderson argues, constitutes a system of cultural representation that succeeds religious communities and dynastic realms. When

does this succession begin? With the printing press and the mass diffusion of printed ideas that enable people who will never meet in person to “imagine” themselves as belonging to a social form—the nation (1983: 15).

Breaking from Gellner and Hobsbawm, Anderson stresses that “imagined” does not equal “fabricated” (1983: 15) – if by “imagined” he meant “fabricated,” he would be juxtaposing nations to other communities that are construed as “real.” Rather, Anderson argues that *all* human collectivities, especially those that transcend the face-to-face level, are “imagined” by their members; they are social constructs of the mind that emerge from real circumstances, however. In the case of the nation, the quest for profit prompted the budding, eighteenth-century book industry to publish in popular languages, targeting the mass, monolingual publics rather than the mere sliver of Latin readers. Economies of scale lumped myriad dialects into a handful of print languages, building unified fields of exchange below Latin and above vernaculars. The novel and the newspaper compelled geographically dispersed co-nationals to imagine each other’s contemporaneous existence and replaced a cyclical conception of time and causality linked vertically to a divine order with a horizontal line of time and reason. Further, the newly-created standardization of print languages helped formulate the fiction of nations hailing from an immemorial past.

Anderson situates national formation in a globalizing world. He identifies the first instances of nationhood in Latin America, where colonies trying to throw off the burden of Spanish rule became infused with Western European intellectual trends. At the same time, these initial national formations became models for nationalisms in Europe, setting standards for the national form of belonging from which it was “impermissible to deviate” (1991: 81).

Thus, Anderson argues that the nation as both a political and ideological “imagined” community first took hold in eighteenth-century Latin America. At the time, the colonies were carved into separate administrative and economic units, sized to be manageable by the available means of technology. The spread of these units circumscribed the circulation of news and traveling state functionaries, thus turning them into communities. Rejection of the Spanish Crown’s oppression combined with the liberal ideas of the Enlightenment to foster nationalist movements of independence. These, in turn, Anderson argues, became models for national desires and achievements in other parts of the globe.

(How) Do People Embrace Nationalism?

The combined wisdom of the three scholars reviewed above is that nationalism, i.e., the normative principle that the political and ethno-cultural unit must coincide, is firmly embedded into the specific socio-historical conditions of modernity, i.e., constructed at a particular time in human existence. Yet the three theorists emphasize different sets of mechanisms that drive the rise of nation and nationalism. Hobsbawm ties the nation to the state, and argues that it organizes social interaction only as long as it constitutes the primary unit of economic development. Gellner attributes nationalism to the industrial era’s need for context-free communication. For Anderson, this form of collective imagination stems from the way technologies of information and communication as well as administrative mechanisms create meaning.

Crucially, the three scholars differ substantially in the ways they explain why, how and to what extent people embrace and normalize this form of collective belonging. For Hobsbawm, people become nationalist, i.e., employ ethno-linguistic criteria to

demarcate political and other sociocultural belongings, in order to secure their own privilege and to limit others' access to resources. National sentiment also grows when the struggles for social transformation acquire a national character. At the same time, the modern state cultivates loyalty and belonging to serve its own administrative needs. Yet Hobsbawm questions whether the ideology of the state or of specific classes ever extends to the entire population and whether or not national sentiment trumps other forms of identification or allegiance – hegemonic ideologies, he argues, are not necessarily indicative of the feelings and thoughts of people who “are not necessarily national and still less nationalist” (1990: 10).

Neither Gellner nor Anderson problematizes the potency or spread of nationalist inculcation. For Gellner, the prestige and functionality of the new linguistic and cultural idiom – whose codification and official association to the national state increase its relative prestige against older, “mere” ethnic idioms – render it the key dimension of identification. Even people whose counter-entropic traits prevent them from assimilating into the national mainstream—the misfits or Others – internalize this model of belonging and strive to acquire their own culturally homogenous nations. Similarly, Anderson speaks of a “deep, horizontal comradeship” (1983: 16) within the nation, which transcends internal chasms. In Section III of this chapter, I harness the ethnographic record to argue that, although nationalist inculcation is pervasive, internal differentiation is never fully erased. Furthermore, shifting socio-historical conditions stand to produce *new* conceptions of collective belonging that stand in addition to as well as in competition with the national. Before I examine these possibilities, however, it is imperative to discuss the recent work of scholars who dispute the socio-historical embeddedness of the

nation as a social form. In the past decade and against the constructivist grain throughout the social sciences, two prominent theorists have rooted the nation in ethnicities (Hutchinson 2005; Smith 1998, 2008). Their theories essentialize culture, deploy the concept of ethnicity without problematizing it, ignore issues of power and nationalism's history of abuse and atrocities, and present an idealized view of the national community. In the words of theorist Umut Özkimirlı "ethnosymbolism is more an attempt to resuscitate nationalism than to explain it, and [...] ethnosymbolists are latter-day Romantics who suffer from a deep sense of nostalgia" (2003: 340).

Ethno-Symbolism: The Nation as a Human Universal

Anthony D. Smith (1998; 2008) and John Hutchinson (2005) build their theories on a critique of scholars Smith bundles together under the label "modernists" – apart from Gellner, Anderson and Hobsbawm, Smith (1998) names Marxists Michael Hechter and Tom Nairn, sociologists Anthony Giddens and Michael Mann, Middle East historian Elie Kedourie and Europe historian John Breuilly. The thread that ties together the work of all these theorists, Smith argues, is the premise, explicit or implicit, that the nation as a form of social organization stems from socio-historical forces specific to modernity. The modernists' approach, Smith argues, fails to account for the causal power of ethnicity and does not explain the intense feelings of loyalty and willingness for sacrifice that the nation induces in its members. Smith and Hutchinson, on the other hand, discern in human collectivities an ethno-cultural "core" that persists through the ages and causes national formation when certain favorable conditions are in place. The nation, then, is a form of *cultural* community and nationalism is an ethnic community's struggle for "autonomy, unity and identity" (Smith 2008: 132), rather than a socio-historically

contingent movement to effect and legitimize ethno-cultural and political correspondence.

For Smith, the nation is not socio-historically embedded, but can occur in any period of human history when polity and ethnicity coincide. It is not a by-product of the state and does not emerge to lend an emotive coating to communities of interest. Instead, the nation constitutes an ethnic group whose territory and culture have been demarcated and institutionalized – a cultural community reinforced with territorial, political and legal solidarity. Ethnicity, i.e., the “myths, memories, symbols, values, and traditions” (2008: 19) that bind a group together, drives national formation and endurance.

Smith locates the first national formations in the ancient Near East and during Classical Antiquity, when polities such as empires, city-states and tribal confederations acquire ethnic trappings. Medieval kingdoms and empires whose elites identify ethnically and collectively also qualify, despite the absence of mass citizenship, participation and identification. Mass consciousness and popular sovereignty are but features of the modern nation, which in turn is but one kind of nation.

Smith draws upon the work of John Armstrong (1982), who views ethnicities and nations as fitting into a continuum of social formations handling belonging. In an analytic move forward from the past to the present, Armstrong detects persistence in group perceptions and sentiments. For Smith, Armstrong’s key contribution is that he supplies what Fredric Barth (1969) wanted to reject, i.e., the cultural content of boundaries. Memories, myths and symbols represent and explain distinct experiences of belonging – therefore culture, writes Smith (1998: 187), is not “some inventory of traits, or a ‘stuff’ enclosed by the border; culture is both an inter-generational repository and heritage, or

set of traditions, and an active shaping repertoire of meanings and images, embodied in values, myths and symbols that serve to unite a group of people with shared experiences and memories, and differentiate them from outsiders”.

Hutchinson (2005) also borrows Armstrong’s *longue durée* perspective which he interprets as a view of nations as long-term, dynamic historical processes that determine contemporary forms of belonging. Unlike Smith, however, Hutchinson situates nations within modernity. But he grounds them firmly in pre-modern ethnic groups, which acquire a political dimension as a means of adapting to changing socio-historical conditions. For Hutchinson, nations are a species of ethnic group, because their members perceive them as descent-based, immemorial and culturally particular. Solidarity derives from kinship and memories of triumphs and trials through the ages. Ethnicity drives national formation and is responsible for nations’ potency, endurance and resonance.

Hutchinson locates national formation – i.e., the extension of ethnic belonging – at the intersection of two modern intellectual movements, Romanticism and the Enlightenment. Romanticism, he argues, ushers in a view of humanity carved throughout its history in affective communities. The two intellectual movements fuse into what Hutchinson terms “national revivalism” (2005: 46), i.e., a movement that unearths select chunks of the forgotten ethnic past and grooms them to forge “a new activist conception of the ethnic community” (2005: 46).

Rather than invent new “cultures” then, Smith and Hutchinson argue that nationalism draws upon lived, pre-existing ties and traditions. An invented past, Smith and Hutchinson both argue, would lack the potency to mobilize the people and elicit loyalty and sacrifice, unless it expressed and amplified pre-existing popular sentiments of

solidarity. To mobilize populations and foster community building, nationalism's selection and revamping of old traditions must occur within strict limits set by the lived culture. The ethnic past, Smith argues, "embodies the peculiar values and traditions of the community, without which there could be no nation and no national destiny" (1998: 115). But since some of the segments selected for nation-building may belong to an "*unknown and forgotten*" (Hutchinson 2005: 74, emphasis mine) past – and hence not to a contemporary population's lived heritage – how do they resonate with the populations they are meant to mobilize? How thick and clear is the line between re-constituted and invented? Further, as Özkimirlı (2003) points out in his critique of ethno-symbolism, determining what is authentic, pure and genuine is an extremely problematic and arbitrary exercise.

Hutchinson diverges from his mentor's work, when he emphasizes the ethnic group's (and subsequent nation's) internal cultural diversity. The ethnic past features multiple, contradictory discourses, which frequently trigger rival nationalist projects. Clashes triggered by this intra-national divergence re-emerge at times of crisis, but a sense of shared values and belonging avert rupture. Despite his flirtation with post-modernism, then, Hutchison, much like Smith, theorizes the nation as a closed cultural container and one with finite scripts for change. The fissures and multiplicities he locates do not roam free, along what post-structuralists Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari term unpredictable "lines of flight" (1987: 10), but remain constrained by a "pre-discursive core" (1987: 6).

In short, ethno-symbolism theorizes the nation as a distinct, culture-bearing group, which owes its formation to ethnicity. For these theorists, ethnicity corresponds to

a shared set of cultural meanings, which has a “core” whose fixity limits the ways the group may change in response to shifting socio-historical conditions. Further, this core keeps internal differentiation and conflict in check. Proof for all this resides in the love and passion the nation evokes in its members and their willingness to sacrifice – a social construct, according to Smith, cannot evoke this kind of strong loyalty and emotion. In what follows, I draw from post-modernist critiques of bounded culture, the Barthian paradigm of ethnicity, and anthropological accounts of the modern state’s dialectic production of sameness and difference to dispute the ethno-symbolists’ arguments. Following Katherine Verdery (1993, 1994) and Brackette Williams (1989), I argue that the analyst’s task is to inquire into the processes and conditions that essentialize and reify “culture” and compel people to perceive it as a thing they possess, rather than reproduce this objectification and assign “culture” causal and explanatory power.

Theories of Culture and Ethnicity

Theorizing “culture” as bounded and isomorphic with ethnic or national groups falls prey to what Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson call the “fiction of cultures as discrete, object-like phenomena” (1992: 7). A product of nationalist ideology and historiography (Verdery 1993; Pieterse 2007), this view of cultures engenders a conception of societies, nations and cultures as bounded and naturally occurring, discontinuous formations. Yet an approach that treats them as such ignores the complex webs of connections and ruptures that straddle physical and cultural borders within and between nations, regions and localities (Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Jenkins 2008; Leach 1954; Pieterse 2007).

The dethronement of this notion of culture as thing-like and in perfect correspondence to a bounded, culturally uniform group goes hand-in-hand with a shift in the conception of ethnicity. The social constructionist model of ethnicity kicked off with Max Weber (1922), who theorized ethnicity as the putative belief in biological or cultural commonality which results from – rather than causes – common historical experiences and joint political action. Anthropologists persisted in theorizing their subject matter, i.e., non-Western peoples, as distinct, culture-bearing units (for critiques see Cohen R. 1974; Jenkins 2008; Verdery 1994), until Edmund Leach's *Political Systems* (1954, cited in Verdery 1994) showed ethnicity to be fluid, flexible and situational, and Fredrick Barth's *Ethnic Group and Boundaries* (1969) clinched the paradigm shift. As Chapter One explicates, Barth's work established that ethnicity is socially constituted and consists in interaction, i.e., in the process of making, maintaining, re-negotiating and crossing group boundaries (Barth 1969; Cohen A. 1974; Jenkins 2008; Verdery 1994). Boundaries demarcating ethnic units persist not because of physical or social isolation, but *in spite of cross-ethnic interaction and fluid membership patterns*, documenting how ethnicity serves as a mechanism to structure social interaction. Ethnic boundaries form and re-form in response to socio-historical conditions, not as a function of the cultural content they enclose. The latter may be shared across boundaries and/or change while boundaries stay in place. In this view, cultural patterns do not cause group formation, but are deployed strategically by particular social actors to accentuate real and perceived similarity and difference across groups of people (Barth 1969; Jenkins 2008).

While it explains how processes of ethnic differentiation operate, Barth's model does not situate these processes socio-historically (Verdery 1993). Verdery, in contrast,

implicates the modern nation-state as a primary vehicle for the production of ethnic sameness and difference (Verdery 1993; see also Williams 1989). Myths of ethno-cultural homogeneity are crucial to the production of the kind of subjectivities necessary to the modern state's administrative tasks; homogenization creates the group of people that the state may administer, because they have something in common. To institutionalize commonality, however, is to make visible all those who fail to hold this something in common – the production of sameness implies the simultaneous production of difference. Difference that previously did not define groups or organize social interaction now becomes socially significant. It serves to demarcate the group that becomes metonymic for the nation-state from the marked ethnic categories with weaker claims to the polity's material and symbolic resources. Ethnicity, then, defined by Verdery (1993, 1994) as the belief in immutable, descent-based and socially-organizing difference, is the product of the nation-state rather than its cause and precursor, as ethno-symbolists argue. And while there can be no disagreement with the argument Smith makes that group formation must rest on some shared cultural features, what he fails to note is the fact that shared features, patterns and dimensions of identification do not cause, but are deployed strategically to mark sameness and difference.

The causal power of ethnic ties in national formation is, for Smith, evident by the love, passion and willingness to sacrifice that the nation induces in its members. Social formations constructed through the agency of a handful of elites and in response to material processes cannot stir intense feelings of belonging and loyalty (Smith 1998). But, as Hobsbawm points out, scholars have limited insight into “the assumptions, hopes, needs, longings and interests of ordinary people, which are not necessarily national and

still less nationalist” (1990: 10). Smith himself relies on elite sources to draw his conclusion, and at times concedes that it is impossible to know what the masses thought in pre-national times (Smith 2001: 71, cited in Özkimirlı 2003). Yet, in taking the nation’s resonance for granted, he ignores the existence of a variety of other motives for behaviors that may be construed as nationalist – for example, the effect of class factors. Early-20th century European middle classes, for example, adopted and fostered an essentialized, particularistic notion of national community in order to further their economic interests (Hobsbawm 1990).

But even if and after the modern state and its mechanisms of inculcations have been successful in spawning the species of “*homo nationalis*” (Balibar 1991: 93) or “[t]he kind of self-consistent person who has an identity” (Verdery 1994: 37), how does this subjectivity fare in late, post, or reflexive modernity when the unprecedented scale of cross-border mobility and contact tears at illusions of fixed and naturalized belonging? While internally fragmented (Bhabha 1990; Chatterjee 1993; Hall 1992), nations in modernity have tended to win over other loci of identification. As I argue in the next section, the national model’s hegemony begins to wobble, particularly since its foundations form but the latest and thinnest layer in a human history marked overwhelmingly by ethnic co-existence.

I now shift from discussing theory to its discussing how it applies to my case study. As I argue in the next section and then through the data chapters of my dissertation, the Greek national model’s hegemony has been and continues to be subjected to multiple critiques and to a wide-ranging, polyvocal debate over who is and should be Greek.

III. FROM ETHNIC CO-EXISTENCE TO “*HOMO NATIONALIS*”: THE GREEK CASE

In Chapter One, I discussed a theoretical framework that posits that collectivity does not stem from a group’s shared sociocultural traits and patterns, but rather from processes of making, maintaining, renegotiating and crossing boundaries with other groups. Specific features a group’s members have in common do not cause group formation, but are deployed and emphasized strategically by social actors to accentuate similarity and difference. The choice of features hinges on socio-historical circumstances, rather than on the features’ actual salience to the group’s self-definition (Barth 1969; Gieryn 1983; Jenkins 2008). Further, I explained that this theoretical lens frames my analysis of discourses and conceptions of collective belonging throughout my dissertation. In the remainder of this chapter, I discuss which markers and why have been utilized to produce and sustain collective boundaries in the Greek pre-national and national contexts. I demonstrate that sociocultural markers and dimensions of identification have fluctuated in salience according to the boundaries social actors were seeking to produce and/or sustain. Further, I discuss the power-laden processes through which people imposed, adopted, resisted, or failed to fit into the nationalist categorical scheme that became first dominant and gradually hegemonic (e.g., Karakasidou 1997).

Heterogeneity as a Human Norm

The last two centuries have registered intense efforts across the globe to normalize the national model of social organization and to represent ethnic homogeneity and fixity as universal human collective patterns (Jenkins 2008). Nationalist thought projects the present backward, essentializing the nationalist model of identification and

belonging, while ignoring changes that have taken place over time (Bosworth 2007; Karakasidou 1997; Kitromilides 1989; Pieterse 2007). Viewed in the light of long-term historical and ethnographic records, however, this has never been the only or, indeed, the dominant form of human collective organization (Mahler 2012; Pieterse 2007). The world has never consisted in “an archipelago of distinct, bounded, culturally distinctive and homogeneous units” (Jenkins 2008: 33); rather, it has always featured complex patterns of interconnections. As the case of the Balkan peninsula – before the advent of nationalism carved it into a number of mutually-hostile nation-states – demonstrates, ethnic difference was considered neither immutable nor the primary axis of social organization (*inter alia* Detrez 2003; Karakasidou 1997; Kitromilides 1989; Mazower 2005; Roudometof 1998). In this subsection, I draw on the historical and ethnographic record to demonstrate that, before nationalist views and practices became hegemonic, patterns of sociocultural identification and exchange were significantly more fluid and mutable than represented in nationalist readings of the past. Apart from evincing the national model’s socio-historical contingency, this discussion also paves the way for the subsequent discussion of the gradual nationalization of collective belonging. Nationalist frameworks and categories superimpose themselves on preexisting schemata of social organization (Pieterse 2007); to understand the construction of specific boundaries and the choice of traits used to mark them in the national context, it is important to understand the relations that precede them and which nationalism endeavors to subsume, alter or erase.

Indeed, while national mythologies have paired each Balkan nation with its pre-modern ethnic group on the basis of religious and/or linguistic continuity, the national

model does not capture the area's historical complexity (Kitromilides 1989; Roudometof 1998). The Ottoman Empire was organized administratively into *millets*, or religious communities. These communities, however, did not correspond to semi-dormant ethnic units – in other words, their members did not perceive themselves in ethno-national terms (Karakasidou 1997; Mazower 2005; Roudometof 1998). In his historical ethnography of Thessaloniki, Mark Mazower (2005) finds that “Turkish” did not mean anything to Muslims, and that Jews, the city's largest religious group until their WWII extermination (Mazower 2005; Margaritis 2005), diverged in their group identification along class lines – the upper classes identified with the European expatriate elite, the middle classes endorsed and sought to join Greek nationalism, while the working classes embraced Judeo-Spanish Communism. A similar situation exists within the *Rum* (i.e., Roman) *Millet*, i.e., the Orthodox Christian subjects of the late Byzantine Empire. Religion was a key marker that united all Orthodox Christians in the empire and drew a boundary between them and the Sultan's remaining subjects. What's more, inside the Orthodox Christian community Greeks, Albanians, Bulgarians, Serbs and Romanians were distinct groups, aware of their differences (Roudometof 1998). The key boundary-making marker, however, was not some notion of common descent or essentialized cultural difference or even the language spoken, but, rather, the position of each group in the local division of labor. People thought of themselves as Greeks, Slavs, or Albanians, for instance, but these labels denoted mostly occupational categories (Karakasidou 1997; Mazower 2005; Roudometof 1998). That is, although later used by nationalists as an indicator of *ethno-national* difference, language was long used *prior* to nationalism to mark occupational groups. For example, because most peasants were Slavic speakers and

most Slavic speakers were peasants, the occupational distinction became an ethno-linguistic distinction. If Slavic speakers migrated to urban areas, took up commerce and moved into the middle class, they learned Greek to navigate their new environment and shifted their ethnic identification to Greek as well – a shift seen as normal and acceptable for generations (Mazower 2005; Roudometof 1998) and even resulting in families straddling “ethnic” lines (Detrez 2003). Further, social, ritual and economic exchange across linguistic and religious lines was completely normative. In the mixed rural community of Greek and Slavic speakers located in present-day Greek Macedonia which Anastasia Karakasidou (1997) studied, Greek speakers migrating into the region married Slavic-speaking women to gain access to local property and wider networks of patronage. Mazower’s Thessaloniki, a city with a vibrant urban life since antiquity, also consists in a diverse society “of almost kaleidoscopic interaction” (2005: 11). In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, for example, less than one third of the city’s residents lived in ethno-linguistic or ethno-religious neighborhoods. During this pre-national, Ottoman era, then, class was a considerably more salient marker of collective boundaries, forming cross-religious or cross-linguistic groupings.

A view of the *Rum Millet* as a composite mosaic of nationalities rather than a unified Christian community divided across class and occupational lines first emerged when the Balkan intelligentsia became exposed to Western discourses of the Enlightenment (Kitromilides 1989). But the salience of previous markers of unity and distinction – namely, religion and class – did not wane overnight. While Greek-speaking intellectuals placed more emphasis on ethnic and linguistic diversity (for example, publishing dictionaries as early as 1770), their guiding logic was not nationalist.

Influenced by the Enlightenment, they sought to “civilize” non-literate or non-Greek-speaking groups within the *Rum Millet* and thus enhance their socioeconomic prospects (Kitromilides 1989).

The Balkan intelligentsia, then, imported into the region Western notions of cultural communities with common language, origins and history. But they did not politicize ethno-cultural identification; they did not use it as the key dimension of similarity and difference to create and justify new schemes of social organization. On the contrary, a lot of these intellectuals envisioned the Ottoman Empire being succeeded in the Balkan Peninsula not by national states but by a multi-ethnic Orthodox Christian polity (Kitromilides 1989). The politicization and reification of ethnic distinctions was the work of the modern state, which emphasizes primordial, immutable ethnicity in order to produce and bolster a new social boundary that subsumes all previous ones; the one that separates nationals from non-nationals (Balibar 1991; Verdery 1994; Williams 1989).

A social formation manages to produce itself as the nation to the extent that the individual is constituted as a species of “*homo nationalis*” (Balibar 1991: 93). *Homo nationalis* is the kind of person “who has an identity” (Verdery 1994: 37), i.e., for whom ethnic identity constitutes the key element of self-conception. The specific historical process of nation-state formation cultivates the idea that to have identities is normal and that any given person can have only one identity of each kind – national, ethnic, gender, etc. For the modern state, identities are the key mechanism to keep track of their political subjects; the rational, systematic administration of people who switch between several dimensions of identification would be close to impossible (Verdery 1994).

Homo nationalis is constituted not by the suppression of all differences, but by their subordination to the one, irreducible difference between nationals and non-nationals (Balibar 1991). People who do not fit neatly into one national category “are an anomaly to be rectified” (Bauman 1995: 3). Their presence in the modern national space is seen as a temporary obstacle to the creation of the perfect homogeneous community. The modern state attempts to correct it by either “*devouring*” or “*vomiting*” (Bauman 1995: 2, emphasis in the original) the strangers. It tries to assimilate them by smothering all cultural and linguistic distinctions and forbidding all traditions and loyalties except those linked to the national order. Or, it tries to banish them, expelling them beyond the national borders, confining them in secluded spaces or physically destroying them altogether.

In the next two subsections I discuss these processes as they have evolved in the Greek national context. More specifically, I discuss a) the gradual nationalization of the category “Greek” on an official, state level, and in terms of the gradual shift in the markers used to define its boundaries b) the processes through which people with various ethnic and social traits came to internalize this new social boundary between nationals and non-nationals and c) the fate, but also the agency of people who either resisted this dichotomous social classification or displayed traits that prevented them from fitting neatly within a national category. These discussions draw on scholars whose findings contest the official, Greek nationalist narrative of a linear, unbroken, ethno-cultural trajectory since the Classical Antiquity and of an ethnically aware group actively awaiting its political substantiation. Almost since its inception in 1830, the Greek state has endeavored to create an ethno-culturally homogeneous populace, deploying tactics

such as population exchanges (Margaritis 2005; Pentzopoulos 1962), expulsions and forced ethno-linguistic assimilation (*inter alia* Karakasidou 1997; Kitromilides 1989; Kostopoulos 2008, 2010; Margaritis 2005; Tsitselikis 2006) in order to fashion itself by mid-twentieth century into “one of the most ethnically homogeneous states in Europe” (Kitromilides 1989: 176). I now turn to these discussions.

From *Rum Millet* to the Nation of the *Hellenes*

The process of nationalizing and essentializing the category “Greek,” which has continued throughout the country’s history, is evident as early as in the years leading up to statehood. Traits that had hitherto marked similarity and difference were gradually phased out in favor of markers drawing increasingly rigid boundaries; by the time period examined in my dissertation, a series of socio-historical processes had culminated in the hegemony of ethnic descent as a marker of collective boundaries.

In this process of nationalizing notions of belonging, Dimitris Christopoulos (2012) detects two distinct phases, which largely reflect the Greek state’s geopolitical objectives and constraints (on the salience of pragmatic concerns during early Greek nationhood see also Vogli 2008). The first phase corresponds to the century extending from 1821, when the national revolution began, to the aftermath of Greece’s 1922 crushing defeat in the Asia Minor irredentist campaign, which put a definite end to the Greece’s territorial expansionism. During this century, according to Christopoulos, the goal was to *create* nationals from the Ottoman subjects who resided in the territories already under revolt, coveted by or gradually annexed to the new state. In 1821, revolutionary leaders declared that Greeks would be the Orthodox Christian residents of the future state’s realm (Christopoulos 2012; Vogli 2008). Residence in the actual or

potential national territory, then, was an important marker of collective boundaries during this first phase (Christopoulos 2012; Vogli 2008). Yet, rather than reflecting a more inclusive conception of membership on the basis of on “vital ties” (Christopoulos 2012: 170), residence as a criterion of inclusion reflected mostly the necessity to provide enough subjects for the new state (Christopoulos 2012). This is a national revolution, largely conceived and outwardly represented as an ethnic political awakening; the state’s new subjects, therefore, must possess such traits that speak to their membership in the Greek ethnic group (Vogli 2008). For this reason, the criterion of territory is resolutely tied to religion; optimal candidates for membership in the budding national polity were the devolving Ottoman Empire’s Orthodox Christian residents, i.e., members of the *Rum Millet*. Religion, then – rather than language, or presumed descent – was the key sociocultural marker of sameness and difference at this point, as the revolt was being waged by Christians of the *Rum Millet* against the Muslim Ottoman Porte and particularly as the Ottoman norm of equating Greek with Orthodox Christian was still very much relevant (Christopoulos 2012; Vogli 2008).

In 1822, national membership was expanded to heterochthonous [*ετερόχθονες*] Orthodox Christians, i.e., residents of territories beyond the revolution’s, or later the state’s realm who wished to migrate to Greek territory (Christopoulos 2012; Vogli 2008). In 1823, the national element became slightly stronger, as language was added to religion as a prerequisite of Greekness, particularly for people who came from abroad. It is key to note, however, that during the first century of Greece’s nationhood and despite official pronouncements, the need to enlarge the new state territorially mitigated the exclusivity of ethno-religious or ethno-linguistic criteria. Jews and Muslims, as well as Slavic,

Albanian, Vlach and Turkish speakers were often included in the Greek nation when their localities were annexed to the Greek state (Christopoulos 2012). In its 1881 annexation of the province of Thessaly and the city of Arta, for example, the state extended membership to the new territories non-Christian and non-Greek-speaking residents (Christopoulos 2012). Far from suggesting a “free-of-charge, liberal cosmopolitanism” (Christopoulos 2012: 46), however, the inclusion into the nation of people with non-Greek ethnic traits came with the expectation that they would assimilate to the state’s dominant linguistic and cultural idiom. Processes of assimilation – or, when this failed, repression or expulsion – are discussed farther into this chapter.

In 1827, ethnic descent, or membership in the Greek *genus* [γένος], superseded language; people coming to the revolution’s realm from abroad were required to prove descent from Greek, rather than merely Greek-speaking parents. The new state’s first nationality law in 1835 also officially privileged *genus*, or membership in the primordial ethnic unit, over territory– anyone coming from abroad with Greek descent would automatically become a national. The term *genus* denotes “biological classification ranking between family and species” (Britannica 2007). In the Greek context, it became an “actual legal category” (Tsitselikis 2006: 147) determining membership in the Greek national community – *omogeneis*, i.e., people of the same *genus*, are considered Greek regardless of their official nationality; *allogeneis*, people of a different *genus*, have limited, if any, avenues to Greek national belonging (Tsitselikis 2006).

Ethnic descent or membership in a primordial unit whose definition touches on the biological is, of course, highly nebulous and impossible to establish, particularly when the notion itself of primordial ethnicity is a novelty after centuries of considerably

different norms of collective belonging, as the last subsection demonstrated. In time, the concept was normalized to a point where it did not require any logical justification; in the twentieth century, as Christopoulos (2012) documents, *omogeneis* and *allogeneis*, i.e., people of either the Greek or another *genus*, have been tautologically defined in official state documents as members of either the Greek [*omoethneis*] or another [*alloethneis*] nation. As a matter of fact, earlier versions of this and other texts related to my project have also reproduced this tautology. My own exposure, since infancy, to Greek sociocultural norms and mechanisms of nationalist inculcation has meant that, for quite a while in the course of this research, I also took the concept of Greek ethnic descent at face value, and overlooked the necessity to untangle it and critically trace its socio-historical emergence. As a result, I reproduced it uncritically, even after I had problematized it enough to decide to embark on research that questions its normative hegemony. Many people whose voices I have “heard” and relay throughout the analysis chapters of my dissertation stagger in similar conceptual quagmires when they try to conceptualize descent and even make it measurable – the balance, albeit precarious, they find on this boggy ground is the result of a lifetime’s expertise in overlooking or rationalizing the concept’s glaring contradictions (Christopoulos 2012).

As Christopoulos’ (2012) critical historical review demonstrates, however, membership in the Greek *genus* has in fact been measurable in the way that it has operated to produce and sustain a specific national boundary. Its main yardstick has not been people’s actual biological or cultural “Greekness,” which would have been impossible to measure, but rather the degree to which they adopted this hegemonically defined “Greekness.” This has corresponded not only to assimilation into the dominant

cultural, religious and linguistic patterns, but also and perhaps primarily to adherence to “the political ideology of Greek ethno-racialism” (Christopoulos 2012: 72), i.e., the official narrative of an ethnically homogeneous nation with an unbroken, linear ethno-cultural trajectory since antiquity. In this way, and particularly during the insular second century of Greece’s statehood, the malleable notion of *genus* has allowed powerful actors in the Greek state to construct a boundary enclosing people who embraced and enacted the dominant imaginary and keeping out those deemed aberrant or threatening to the ongoing process of national homogenization (Christopoulos 2012; Tsitselikis 2006). Far from problematic, then, the conceptual ambiguity of *genus* has actually been an asset to Greek state mechanisms insofar as it has afforded them the discretionary power to include only the kind of loyal subject who has acquired “an identity” (Verdery 1994: 37) and exclude on the basis not only of easily assessable traits, such as language or religion, but also of the nebulous notions of national morale [*φρόνημα*] or national consciousness [*συνείδηση*] (Christopoulos 2012; Tsitselikis 2006).

National morale first appears as a marker of belonging in the Greek *genus* in the 1835 law. In the new state’s first nationality law, the criteria posited as reliable indicators of membership in the Greek *genus* were religion and national morale, the latter substantiated at this point by people’s willingness to move to the Greek realm from the Ottoman Empire or Europe (Vogli 2008). During this first century, Christopoulos (2012) argues, *genus* acted as an umbrella that included considerable linguistic and cultural diversity, yet it became gradually more ethnicized, as the religious criterion was not enough in the case of Orthodox populations who had not assimilated linguistically or who had aligned themselves with rival, neighboring nationalisms. The boundaries of *genus*

tightened when Greece's territorial expansionism ended with its army's 1922 crushing defeat to the Turkish army in the Asia Minor shores. The main goal henceforth, Christopoulos (2012) argues, has no longer been to create Greeks, but to get rid of people the Greek state has been unable or unwilling to assimilate into the dominant idiom. This has entailed banishing or quashing not only linguistic and religious difference, but also ideological. Particularly given the need – real or exaggerated – to protect the state's territorial integrity from neighboring nationalisms, Greek ethnic traits, i.e., religion and language, have since been auxiliary to national consciousness in determining membership in the Greek *genus* and, consequently, the nation. In other words, adherence to the official, nationalist Greek ideology has become the main indicator of belonging in the primordial ethnic unit. Since 1927, the infamous Article 19 of the Greek Nationality Code (initially passed as a Presidential Decree and incorporated in the GNC in 1955) stipulated that *allogeneis* (i.e., people of a different *genus*) who left the country with no intent of returning could lose their nationality status (Anagnostou 2005). Enforced arbitrarily, Article 19 cost some 50,000 Muslims their Greek nationality by attributing “intention of not returning” to Greece without consulting individuals or families (Anagnostou 2005: 339; Christopoulos 2012). The boundaries of *genus*, however, in the twentieth century also excluded Greek leftists, particularly after the Left's defeat in the 1947-1949 Greek Civil War and the subsequent intensification of political antagonisms (Christopoulos 2012; Panourgia 2009) – as a result, some 56,000 ethnic Greeks who fled to the Communist Bloc during the war were also deprived of nationality status.

In other words, since the 1920s the boundaries of *genus* – and therefore of the national community – have become increasingly tight, with national consciousness

working along with but mostly superseding language and religion to mark them (Christopoulos 2012; Tsitselikis 2006). The primacy of national consciousness is evinced by the fact that people unquestionably Greek in terms of religion and language were excluded from the national body for half of the twentieth century based on their anti nationalist politics (Christopoulos 2012; Panourgia 2009; Tsitselikis 2006). And even after leftists were re-admitted into the national body in the early 1980s (Christopoulos 2012; Panourgia 2009), national consciousness has remained operative in determining the membership prospects of post-1989 migrants with Greek ethnic traits, primarily from former Soviet states (Christopoulos 2012).

This nationalization of collective boundaries outlined in this subsection reflects multiple factors, not least the joint effects of a reactionary, ethno-biological nationalism and the state's geopolitical necessities (Christopoulos 2012; Vogli 2008). Yet a major question that must be addressed is how this new classificatory scheme went from dominant to hegemonic (Karakasidou 1997) – in other words, how people initially compelled to switch their identifications and allegiances came to adopt nationalism and even normalize it. In the next subsection, I discuss how people whose identification had been based on religion, class and locality for the most part gradually came to see themselves as members of a primordial ethno-national unit. In this discussion, I draw on historical and ethnographic scholarship that has examined these processes as they evolved during the first half of the twentieth century. From 1912 to 1923, three wars and the international treaties that followed each war resulted in major demographic reconfigurations. The 1912-'13 Balkan Wars doubled Greece's population, yet also rendered it significantly more plural, as less than half the people in the new territories

bordering Serbia, Bulgaria and the devolving Ottoman Empire were Greek-speaking Orthodox Christians (Pentzopoulos 1962). Population exchanged with Bulgaria in 1919 and Turkey in 1923 concentrated most people with Greek ethnic traits, i.e., mostly religion but also language, within the Greek national realm (Pentzopoulos 1962). Yet despite their mass character, these exchanges left Greece with a Slavic-speaking cohort in western Macedonia (Karakasidou 1997; Kostopoulos 2010), a linguistically and culturally heterogeneous Muslim cohort in the country's northeastern tip bordering both Turkey and Bulgaria (Kostopoulos 2008), an Albanian-speaking, Muslim population in the northwestern border with Albania (Margaritis 2005), and vibrant Jewish communities in urban centers, particularly Thessaloniki (Mazower 2005; Margaritis 2005) – to name the most visible populations with non-Greek ethnic traits. Further and crucially, the wars and the subsequent exchanges also brought in some 1.5 million Orthodox Christians (Pentzopoulos 1962), i.e., people hegemonically defined as Greek mostly on the basis of their religion, but whose life experiences and, therefore, patterns of identification differed considerably from those of mainland inhabitants (Hirschon 1989; Mavrogordatos 1983; Mazower 2005).

The next subsection, then, deals with these cohorts' identification processes vis-à-vis the state and the new dominant nationalist worldview. Adopting this worldview was not automatic, but rather the result of a series of *processes* (Karakasidou 1997; Mazower 2005), even for people whose language and religion qualified them for membership in the national community. Drawing on scholarship that has examined these processes critically, I argue that people's social traits, beliefs and trajectories placed them in diverse positions

vis-à-vis the state's economic and administrative structures, but also its apparatus of ideological indoctrination, resulting in a variety of paths to nationhood.

I should note that these arguments, explicated in the next section, derive primarily, albeit not exclusively, from the seminal historical ethnography of Anastasia Karakasidou (1997). In my reading of the literature, her work consists in a rare inquiry that not only spans a century of nation-building processes, but also documents these processes on a level that extends from the state to the minutely local, shedding bright light on their intricate connections. I contextualize and triangulate Karakasidou's conclusions from her in-depth fieldwork in a small village in northern Greece by comparing them critically with the findings of other historical ethnographies – or ethnographic histories – of urban centers or other localities throughout the country (Kostopoulos 2008, 2010; Margaritis 2005; Mazower 2005).

Much like my own, Karakasidou's motivation for conducting her research reflects, in part, her particular positionality within the Greek national context. The child of an Asia Minor Orthodox Christian refugee father who acquired a sense of Greek nationhood after spending his formative years in a Greek national orphanage yet still tuned his radio to Istanbul radio stations and sang along with the Turkish songs, Karakasidou set out to examine how people with diverse cultural influences had come to see themselves as part of a single national "culture" and to trace the historical transformations that replaced fluid social boundaries with essentialized notions of collective belonging.

Karakasidou does not describe her father's identification processes in any detail. For the national project, however, and as I argued in the previous subsection, people like

Karakasidou's father who straddle two or more sets of cultural patterns arbitrarily demarcated, reified and labeled as national, must be shifted and repositioned neatly within one national "culture" (*inter alia* Balibar 1991; Karakasidou 1997; Kostopoulos 2008, 2010; Verdery 1994). The next subsection describe these processes – how such shifts happened in the Greek context throughout the country's purification era, and what were the reactions and consequences when, for a number of reasons, they did not. These discussions are necessary for two reasons. First, they demonstrate the socially detrimental effects of the nationalist project, particularly for people who do not adopt the dominant idiom. Further and crucially, an understanding of how people came to hold the views – nationalist, anti-nationalist and several shades in between – that they do on collective belonging in general and their own (Greek) collective belonging in particular consists in a necessary background to the remainder of my dissertation.

Creating "*Homo Nationalis*"

Karakasidou's (1997) field site is a village 15 miles north of Thessaloniki, caught since the late 1870s and at least until the 1913 conclusion of the Balkan Wars in the middle of Greece's and Bulgaria's converging nationalist campaigns. Assiros, as the Greeks later renamed it, or Guvezna, as was its Ottoman name, was home to Orthodox Christian Slavic and Greek speakers – in other words, people within the *Rum Millet*, whose boundaries largely determined those of the Greek nation and *genus* throughout Greece's expansionist era. Prior to the advent of nationalism in the region and as discussed earlier in this chapter, linguistic boundaries also coincided with occupational ones – Greek was the trade language and Greeks speakers enjoyed commercial dominance and thus perceived themselves as an interest group, albeit one open to

upwardly mobile Slavic speakers, with whom they mixed in property and affinal networks (Karakasidou 1997).

The Greek and Bulgarian nation-building campaigns started competing for Macedonia's Christians in the late 1870s; through its consuls in the region, Athens²⁰ began a full-fledged indoctrination campaign including the establishment of newspapers, churches, schools and various "cultural" associations, preaching the notion of a primordial, pure ethno-national unit. Chronologically, this followed the conflictual 1872 division of the Orthodox Church into the increasingly nationally-allied Patriarchate (Greek) and Exarchate (Bulgarian) (Karakasidou 1997; Kitromilides 1989). From this point on, language and religion gradually became politicized and marked increasingly rigid boundaries – people who did not wish to identify with either Greece or Bulgaria did not have enough resources to consolidate themselves independently and claim belonging on the basis of locality and alternative social networks (Karakasidou 1997). Key to note however is the fact that the nationalization of language and ritual services put Slavic speakers in a different category from Greek speakers vis-à-vis the incoming Greek state – crucially, this combined with the two linguistic cohorts' pre-existing class differences, which morphed into diverse relationships to the new state's economic and administrative structures. Based on their linguistic and class attributes, then, the village residents followed two distinct, albeit intertwined, paths to nationhood.

According to Karakasidou, Greek speakers who enjoyed economic and symbolic dominance in the area, i.e., merchants, teachers and priests, allied themselves to the state and its resources during Greece's vicious, underground armed struggle with Bulgaria in

²⁰ Bulgaria's nation-building strategies are beyond the scope of this argument.

1904-'08 and as soon as Greece annexed the region in 1912-'13, in order to safeguard and enhance their socioeconomic dominance. At the turn of the century, Karakasidou argues, few local families felt or displayed any national affiliation. Greek speakers supported the Greek army to save their lives during partisan raids but also in a quest for opportunities to expand their economic interests and influence in the village's market community.

On its part and to secure the new frontier, the state empowered this interest group to administer its initiatives in the region and offered wide channels to economic and social mobility. People who already dominated the area's market economy became the new state's tax collectors, policemen, civil and church administrators, teachers, but also major landowners, following a pattern of land redistribution in the 1920s that benefited disproportionately those who had allied themselves to the national cause. The Greek speakers' exclusive access to and management of the area's productive resources and administrative mechanisms consolidated their existing dominance over Slavic speakers and tightened the previously fluid class boundary between the two linguistic cohorts. Poor Slavic speakers offered Greeks their labor and were thus drawn into relations of not only economic, but also social patronage and dependency. These hierarchical, clientelistic ties, along with their participation in the educational system, the church and collective rites, gradually pulled Slavic speakers into the ideology of Hellenism, whose growing political legitimacy represented it as a superior to local conceptions of identity.

Meanwhile, the Greek-speaking elite worked along with the state to create schools that not only educated and molded Greece's new bureaucrats, but also fostered the idea of the nation through religious, language and history studies – the creation of a literate class

that also enjoyed economic dominance widened the gap between the linguistic-*cum*-class cohorts and strengthened the Greek idiom's ideological supremacy. The church, also allied with the national state, consisted in the other major channel of national indoctrination, particularly given its pre-existing role as the major mediator of Orthodox Christians' social life and identification processes throughout the Ottoman era. Not only were key markers of collective belonging, i.e., language and religion, imbued with new meaning, but the institutional loci of social (re)production related to these two dimensions of identification also turned themselves into channels through which people transitioned into a new conception of collective membership as belonging in a primordial ethno-national unit (Karakasidou 1997).

In the previous subsection, I discussed national consciousness, i.e., adherence to the official nationalist ideology, as a marker of national boundaries. This became relevant to Karakasidou's research subjects during and after Greece's vicious 1946-'49 Civil War, where the Left's defeat confined Greek leftists to the margins of the national community for a good three decades (e.g., Panourgia 2009). By this time, Karakasidou (1997) argues, village residents were stratified along class rather than ethno-linguistic lines – in other words, relations of patronage and dependency had rendered ethno-linguistic distinctions less relevant. The defeat of the Left boosted the power of the local ruling class, already closely allied to the pre-war ultra-nationalist political establishment, by endowing it with a new policing authority against leftists and putting it in charge of local militia units that terrorized political dissenters and exerted control over the village until the Socialists' first electoral victory in 1981 (Karakasidou 1997). Crucially, the new political divide offered Slavic speakers a prime chance for inclusion “under the banner of patriotic Greek

nationalism” (Karakasidou 1997: 226), provided that they displayed national consciousness not only by fully shedding Slavic speech but also by embracing anti-communist views and practices.

Karakasidou’s conclusions on how people came to internalize new social boundaries and patterns emerge from her research in a small, rural, Orthodox Christian community whose residents’ perhaps sole path to socioeconomic mobility passed through the new state’s economic, administrative as well as ideological structures. In the neighboring urban environment of Thessaloniki, however, “Greekness” emerged in opposition to religious difference and in spite of long-standing, intricate cross-communal class and political alliances which persisted long after the city’s annexation. Mark Mazower’s (2005) ethnographic history of the bustling metropolis, Greece’s second-largest city located just a few miles away from Karakasidou’s field site, confirms the latter’s argument that represents becoming Greek as the gradual result of linking people’s fates to the state’s economic and administrative structures and fostering correspondence between class and the now-nationalized linguistic or religious dimensions of identification in order to increase the latter’s salience. In Thessaloniki, also annexed in 1913, difference here was mostly religious – apart from Muslims expelled in 1923, the city was also home to a vibrant, 400-year-old community of Jews who made up some sixty percent of its population. Crucially, these were far from optimal candidates for nationalization, since religion has consisted in a critical marker of Greek ethno-national boundaries. The people who, according to Mazower (2005), in the course of time became the city’s Greeks were Orthodox Christian refugees, who arrived en masse from various areas of the former Ottoman Empire in 1922-’23 and were strategically settled in

Thessaloniki in order to alter the city's ethno-religious composition. A heterogeneous population united through their traumatic experience of displacement (also Hirschon 1989; Karakasidou 1997; Mavrogordatos 1983), refugees effected a major shift to the city's demographic balance; from 25 percent in 1913, "Greeks" made up 75 percent of Thessaloniki's population in 1928. In the village Karakasidou studied, refugees were marginalized socioeconomically similarly to Slavic speakers, because a "Greek" cohort that could embody the new idiom was already available (Karakasidou 1997). In Thessaloniki, however, these refugees became the main material through which the new nation would emerge (Mazower 2005). Although decades would pass before they stopped thinking themselves as refugees, their common socioeconomic circumstances in the new land combined with national party politics to gradually morph them into an interest group, economic and electoral (Mavrogordatos 1983; Mazower 2005), against Jews. In a process that Mazower terms "demographic engineering" (2005: 266), Greek authorities strategically displaced Jews from the city center and demolished the uprooted through the 1923 population exchange Muslims' places of worship and other buildings whose architecture bore testimony to the city's 400 years of Ottoman history – at the same time, newcomers further hellenized, perhaps unwittingly, the city, giving streets, neighborhoods and shops Greek names from the homelands they had left. In the years leading up to WWII, nationalist discourses represented Jews as a compact, ethnic group allied to such anti-national causes as Communism or Bulgarian irredentism; further, national politicians seeking electoral gains fostered economic competition between Jews and Orthodox Christians (Mavrogordatos 1983; Mazower 2005). During the Nazi occupation, Greek nationalists and merchant and professional classes in particular

mounted no resistance toward anti-Jewish measures, motivated, Mazower (2005) argues, not by racism, but by extreme nationalism, which made them accept any measures necessary to weaken the role of other ethnic groups in the life of the city, as well as by a desire for access to vast Jewish properties (see also Margaritis 2005). As a result, less than five percent of the city's Jews escaped deportation to Nazi extermination camps.

The process of national homogenization, then, in these highly plural areas, was not easy; in the course of the twentieth century, nationhood was forged in the flames of a number of wars. Those who suffered the most during these armed conflicts but also during the class reconfigurations that occurred in the context of the nationalizing project, Karakasidou (1997) argues, were those who held on to aspects of their identification and social beliefs, networks and practices that clashed with the national. In the village she studied, these people weren't many – the homogenization process there was highly successful and the village evolved into a staunch nationalist bastion. Its inhabitants were all Orthodox Christians – through the class reconfigurations and mechanisms of ethno-ideological indoctrination to which they were exposed and in which they participated in various capacities, they also shed or replaced existing or acquired new social beliefs and attributes in a way that enabled them to fit neatly within the ethno-national boundaries. By the 1960s, Karakasidou argues, Assiros residents viewed the primordial nation as a natural social collectivity, notwithstanding this view's inconsistencies with their personal, lived histories. Similarly by this time in Thessaloniki, Orthodox Christians, mostly refugees, had become the city's Old Guard; further, intra-national migrants arriving from the countryside had no recollection of the city's mosques and synagogues, torn down and gradually replaced with concrete blocks of flats (Mazower 2005).

In other parts of Macedonia, however, as well as elsewhere in Greece, the process of ethno-national homogenization has not been nearly as successful or complete. People, such as Thessaloniki's Jews, whose religion excluded them from the *Rum Millet* and the subsequent Greek *genus*, people who maintained their linguistic difference, people whose borderland localities placed them in the center of ongoing inter-nationalist tugs of war, or people whose politics clashed with the state and its dominant nationalist idiom remained peripheral to the national project and had deficient access to the nation-state's material and symbolic resources as a result. Seen as aberrant and dangerous, these people were subjected to forceful processes of assimilation, or, when this failed or was not attempted at all for various reasons, physically expelled, exterminated or confined to the fringes of Greek society and excluded from the bulk of its resources. Albanian-speaking Muslims in Western Greece who dodged the 1923 population exchange with Turkey by arguing vital ties to their locality in The League of Nations were physically exterminated in the course of a few months in 1943-'44 by the forces of EDES (National Republican Greek League), the nationalist branch of the resistance movement, who violently concluded the "soft" ethnic cleansing process the Greek state had been conducting during the previous three decades mostly through property expropriations (Margaritis 2005). Slavic speakers that, unlike Karakasidou's research subjects, did not assimilate and instead sought recognition of their linguistic difference, e.g., education in their own language, were subjected to imprisonment or internal exile, excluded from the public sector, pushed to emigrate and deprived of Greek nationality status (Kostopoulos 2010); similarly, a linguistically heterogeneous Muslim cohort in Thrace officially exempted from the population exchanges was forced to subsist in a restricted military area well into the 1990s

(Kostopoulos 2008). Crucially, the links of these cohorts to neighboring nationalisms, often claimed by the Greek state as the reason for its harsh stance against them, do exist in the case of some of their members (Karakasidou 1997; Kostopoulos 2008, 2010; Margaritis 2005). Rather than an *a priori* nationalist, anti-Greek sentiment, however, these links were forged as a result of these populations' entrapment between clashing national projects, and constitute a subsistence strategy not dissimilar from some of their other members' adherence to the Greek nationalist mechanism (Karakasidou 1997; Kostopoulos 2008, 2010; Margaritis 2005).

In their vast majority, these processes of doing away with difference evolved throughout the first half of the twentieth century. Brought to the fore through recent academic research, they belie the official discourse, which claims that Greece's brief experience with plurality ended through the 1919 and 1923 population exchanges and that the people who remained in the national realm had been Greek, in terms of ethnic traits and sentiment alike, prior to the nationalist project. Yet, a scant four decades after a lot of the dust raised by all these physical and symbolic shifts had settled, the mass advent of immigrants first from neighboring Albania and former Soviet Republics and later and to a lesser extent from Southeast Asia and sub-Saharan Africa brought the question of ethnic plurality to the fore once again.

IV. CONCLUSION

Drawing on the historical and ethnographic record of the Greek national and pre-national contexts, this last subsection documented the processes through which nationalist actors and the modern state apparatus have striven to craft *Homo Nationalis*, i.e., the kind of person who privileges ethno-national membership over all other

dimensions of her identification and who normalizes the idea that people must fit neatly within sets of sociocultural patterns arbitrarily demarcated, reified and labeled as national. These discussions in the second half of the chapter followed a critical review, in the first half, of the main theories on nations and nationalism. Situating my research within the constructivist camp, I argued that as a form of collective organization, nations are firmly embedded in modernity; rather than a “natural” or “normal” worldview, nationalism is a socio-historically contingent ideology that prescribes a certain model of collective belonging.

In the remainder of my dissertation, I wish to add to this body of knowledge on nationalism in general and Greek nationalism in particular by examining how, less than a half century after a nationalist view of the world had achieved hegemony in Greece in spite of its contenders, the *de facto* re-pluralization of the homogenized national body in the wake of mass immigration has prompted people to re-think the nationalist model of collective belonging – if only to re-affirm it – or has given them the chance to voice hitherto little-heard, contending views. Indeed, the data chapters that follow do demonstrate that the mass presence of immigrants in the Greek national space has, in fact, triggered polyvocal and contentious debates among the natives on the construction, character and future of the collectivity’s boundaries. To anticipate, this research confirms the findings of the historical and ethnographic scholarship discussed so far – namely that nationalism is not the only and therefore not the natural or normal worldview or model of social organization. Rather, I argue that conceptions of collective belonging are contingent on people’s broader ideological context(s) and social, political and economic orientations.

Chapter 3: Research Design

I. INTRODUCTION

As the previous chapter explicates, this research launches forward from Eric Hobsbawm's (1990) contention that we may not assume that people across the board embrace a nationalist view of collective belonging. In this chapter, I explain the process of finding voices that reflect the "range of variability" (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 143) of views on collective membership. To anticipate, this range spans the spectrum from a highly exclusive, ethno-biological conception of national belonging to a view that posits a clean break between ethnicity and political membership, and instead predicates the latter on one's social ties and interests within a political community. Section II explains the rationale as well as the process of data collection. Section III discusses the analytical process of "conceptual ordering" (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 15), i.e., the process of detecting the central patterns within the body of data and expressing these patterns as conceptual abstractions. Section IV offers a list and short description of the conceptual categories that emerged through the analytical process, summarizes the range of voices uncovered in the course of this research, and explicates how segments in my data are introduced and organize my discussion in the data chapters of my dissertation.

At the outset, I indicate that the data collection occurred in Greek and was analyzed in Greek by myself – a native speaker of both Greek and English. Whenever I reference quotations from the data rendered in English for my dissertation, then, I have done the translations myself. On occasion when the choice of a term or phrase used by the person "speaking" is deemed significant enough to provide further nuance to the potential Greek-speaking reader, I provide the original in brackets.

II. DATA COLLECTION

In this section, I explain the rationale that guided the collection of data for my study, and then describe the data collected. The primary research methodology guiding my study is Grounded Theory (Corbin and Strauss 1998). In Grounded Theory, data collection and analysis are meant to occur interchangeably, and to inform each other throughout the course of the research. More specifically, the principle of “theoretical sampling” (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 73) dictates that, depending on the theoretical insights that emerge in the course of the analysis, the researcher looks for new data at places, people or events expected to maximize the findings’ conceptual variation; collection stops when further sampling is not expected to widen the conceptual range. In the case of the present research, places (discursive fora), events (instances of collective debate) and people (social actors) were selected at the outset and according to the rationale I explicate in the remainder of this section. Given my study’s goal to capture as wide a range as possible of Greeks’ conceptions of collective belonging that were expressed in the public debate on the prospect of *jus soli*, I looked for data in a variety of sources that provided access to the official discourses of politicians, people promoting partisan objectives as well as their own views in online fora, journalists and news pundits writing in mainstream newspapers, and public intellectuals who spoke out on the issue. The possibility of sampling theoretically and altering or expanding the data pool remained open throughout the course of data analysis. The data collected proved sufficient, however, to produce useful and saturated conceptual categories, such that further sampling and collection did not become necessary.

Data for my study span the period from late summer 2009 to mid-March 2010. The Socialists' imminent election in Greece's October 2009 national elections encouraged *jus soli* proponents to push the issue into the spotlight, particularly since the Socialist Party had already indicated its intention to submit a *jus soli* bill for vote at the new National Assembly (Katsounaki 2009). Articles on the prospect and possible ramifications of *jus soli* started appearing in Greek newspapers as early as August 2009. Following months of debate in diverse fora, the bill was voted into law on March 11, 2010, and discussion left the spotlight gradually after that time. Data sources were the following:

Official Political Discourses

These consist of the records of the parliamentary discussions of the *jus soli* bill, from the time it was first discussed in the National Assembly and until the conclusion of the voting process. To retrieve them, I conducted a search using "nationality" [ιθαγένεια] as the keyword in the records page of the Greek parliament's website, <http://www.hellenicparliament.gr/>. The search of the parliamentary website yielded a total of five parliamentary sessions when the bill was discussed extensively and as part of the day's deliberation agenda.²¹ I did not draw a sample, but read through and analyzed the records of these five sessions in their entirety. In chronological order, these sessions were the following:

²¹ The search yielded a total of 36 sessions; apart from the five analyzed here, the bill was mentioned tangentially and discussed briefly in the course of discussions on different topics. A session also excluded from analysis dealt with the constitutionality of a clause introducing voting rights for permanent residents in local elections; as my study does not cover that part of the bill, I did not include this session in my data.

- (1) November 16, 2009: A discussion generated by a current question²² posed by Evangelos Antonaros, MP of the center-right, main opposition party. Antonaros posed his question after the Socialist Prime Minister, George²³ Papandreou, had officially announced his newly elected government's intention to introduce *jus soli* into the Greek Nationality Code at the Global Forum on Migration and Development, whose third annual meeting took place in Athens, from November 2 to November 5, 2009.
- (2) February 8, 2010: A discussion at the level of party leaders requested by the head of the far-Right LAOS party, Giorgos Karatzaferis.
- (3) March 9, 2010: Assembly-wide deliberation in preparation for the voting process.
- (4) March 10, 2010: Assembly-wide deliberation in preparation for the voting process; discussion on the bill in principle.
- (5) March 11, 2010: Assembly-wide deliberation in preparation for the voting process; discussion on the bill's individual articles.

Newspapers

Print media commonly reflect mainstream and elite discourses (Mautner 2008).

Data for my study came from four national-circulation newspapers: *Proto Thema*, *I Kathimerini*, *Eleftherotypia*, and *To Vima*, and also included commentary pieces only from one additional newspaper, as I explain below. Apart from *Proto Thema*, which was

²² A "current question" refers to a question addressed by a Member of the Parliament to the Prime Minister or any of the government's ministers in relation to an issue of current significance. The party addressed must then offer an oral response. Retrieved from <http://www.hellenicparliament.gr/en/Koinovouleftikos-Elenchos/Mesa-Koinovouleutikou-Elegxou>

²³ Per the transliteration system I use, explained in Chapter One, his first name should be written as "Giorgos," not "George." Papandreou, however, is internationally known as "George;" to spare my readers any confusion, I opted to refer to him as "George" throughout my dissertation.

launched in 2005, the other newspapers in this sample go back several decades, and are staples in the Greek news scene. *Proto Thema* epitomizes right-wing populism and engages in tabloid-type journalism. *I Kathimerini* represents center-right, sophisticated journalism and is traditionally favored by the Greek urban upper classes; socially liberal with a patrician tinge while aggressively neo-liberal economically, it publishes an English edition along with *The International Herald Tribune*. *To Vima* resembles *Kathimerini* in the quality and readership to which it aspires, but has a more casual, contemporary manner, and traditionally close ties to the Socialist Party. *Eleftherotypia* was, until it shut down because of economic woes in December 2011²⁴, Greece's *par excellence* center-left newspaper; the exclusive interlocutor of urban guerilla groups, it also has a strong record of investigative journalism on, among others, "nationally-sensitive" topics, such as ethnic minorities whose existence the Greek state tends to hush. I must note that the sample initially included *Rizospastis* and *Avgi*; the first is the official newspaper of the Greek Communist Party (KKE) and the second is affiliated to Greece's other left-wing party represented in the National Assembly, the Coalition of the Radical Left (SYRIZA). These were excluded from the sample, because their articles overwhelmingly and openly reflect official party views, to which I had access through the parliamentary proceedings included in my sample. Specific commentary pieces published in *Avgi*, however, were included in the "Public Intellectuals" dataset, described in the section on data analysis.

Newspaper articles were retrieved through a search using "nationality" [ιθαγένεια] as the keyword in each newspaper's online search engine, as well as in the PDF files of *Proto Thema*'s Sunday edition, whose contents are not included in the newspaper's

²⁴ It has since reopened, but without most of its former news and editorial team.

online edition. This search yielded a total of 183 articles in *Eleftherotypia*²⁵, 87 in *Vima*, 80 in *Kathimerini*, and 37 in *Proto Thema*. The period covered ranges from late August 2009 to mid March 2010; while the Socialists did not formally announce their plans until October, newspapers sympathetic or affiliated to the *jus soli* camp started promoting the legislative initiative earlier. Articles were classified as news, features or commentary in a process discussed in the section on data analysis.

Online Fora

Literature on online public fora, particularly social media, argues that, rather than disconnected places hosting the production and enactment of new identities, online public fora in general (boyd²⁶ and Ellison 2007; Miller and Slater 2000), and Facebook in particular (boyd and Ellison 2007; Lewis *et al.* 2008; Zhao *et al.* 2008), are embedded in offline social contexts, (re)producing and enacting offline social knowledge and identities. Online data for my study were mined from two different types of online public fora: Opengov, a government-sponsored site created to allow public commentary on proposed legislation, and Facebook, the social network site (SNS) that has emerged in the past five or so years as a major locus of political engagement, agenda-setting and communication (*inter alia* Groshek and Al-Rawi 2013; Wooley *et al.* 2010; Valtysson 2012). I decided to collect data from these two sites for a number of reasons. First, because they hosted a significant part of the public debate on the proposed law – so much so that this was noted repeatedly in traditional media, which reported on this online discursive activity, and pondered its significance to the larger debate underway (e.g.,

²⁵ Excluded from analysis was a regular column that re-published segments of articles on the bill originally published in other newspapers.

²⁶ The lower case is intentional and reflects the author's own preference.

Eleftherotypia 2010b; *I Kathimerini* 2010). As soon as it opened for commentary on the *jus soli* bill, Opengov was flooded with submissions for or against the proposed law. This government-sponsored, public deliberation forum was created by the Socialists shortly after their October 2009 election in order to allow public commentary on proposed pieces of legislation. The forum opened a thread for comments on the naturalization bill on December 28, 2009. The thread remained opened until January 7, 2010. During this time, 3,403 comments were submitted. Given the enormity of this data set, I read and analyzed 438 submissions, until the point of “theoretical saturation” (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 143), i.e., until new data no longer yielded any new theoretical insights. Comments submitted to the website were read and analyzed initially in their order of submission and later in a chance (*not* random) order. The section on data analysis explicates this sampling decision, as well as the conceptual results it produced. Further, it explains how I initially treated Opengov data as disembodied from their physical authors, yet was compelled in the course of the analysis to link these data not to specific persons – something that would have been close to impossible – but to their authors’ partisan and ideological contexts and expediencies.

By the time I write my dissertation, Facebook requires little introduction. My own extensive use of this social network site, since 2006, as a venue for political engagement was what initially compelled me to use it as a source of data for my dissertation. More specifically, I had noticed that most debates on issues related to Greek national identification and boundary-making processes played out on Facebook to some degree. On the basis of this long, although unsystematic, observation, I hypothesized that the discussions it hosted on the *jus soli* bill would widen the range of social actors whose

voices I could harvest, and thus also potentially widen my findings' conceptual range. More specifically, I hypothesized that Facebook discussants could include people not as embedded in partisan and established structures of power as politicians, public intellectuals and mainstream news agents²⁷. In other words, Facebook discussants could include politically engaged people, such as activists, who usually do not enjoy access to mainstream fora in the same way that more “prestigious” actors do. Or they could include people with no particular political roles or expediencies, who might still very well take advantage of the easy access and informal atmosphere to express their views on this highly publicized and highly contentious issue. Scholarship on Facebook and political engagement supports this hypothesis. Scholars argue for the *potential* of SNS in general and Facebook in particular to expand political participation to people who lack the money, time, skills, or social capital to participate through traditional venues; this is because SNS are theorized as “non-hierarchical, informal networks that eschew traditional intermediaries such as campaigns, parties and interest groups” (Schlozman *et al.* 2010: 498). This theorized potential has launched a major line of inquiry on whether SNS use actually does raise the levels of political participation, online as well as offline, of previously disengaged people (*inter alia* Baumgartner and Morris 2012; Dimitrova *et al.* 2011; Fernandes *et al.* 2010; Groshek and Al-Rawi 2013; Gustaffson 2012; Schlozman *et al.* 2010; Towner 2012; Gil de Zúñiga *et al.* 2012; Zhang *et al.* 2010). My study does not contribute to this inquiry, particularly since I did not triangulate online observation by contacting the SNS users whose conversations I examined and inquiring

²⁷ Although Opengov was also hailed as the “ordinary” citizen’s forum for expressing views on pending legislation, I did not assume this was the case when I decided to use it as a source of data.

into how their participation in this specific political conversation on Facebook related to their offline political ties and engagement. Further, my dissertation is not so much interested in the effects of Facebook on political participation, but on the access that Facebook could afford me to the voices of more categories of social actors – voices that could widen my findings’ conceptual range. In the section on data analysis, I draw on key studies (Acquisti and Gross 2006; boyd and Ellison 2007; Donath and boyd 2004; Lampe *et al.* 2007) to argue that participants in SNS, and particularly on Facebook, are usually identified by their real names, and – much more reliably – by their networks of connections, which make it relatively easy to moor them in their offline social contexts. The purpose was not to identify individual participants, but to acquire some sense of whether I was dealing with political operatives or people with specific offline partisan or ideological contexts that dictated or informed their boundary-making arguments. Much like in the case of Opengov, the need to link these online submissions to their authors’ offline contexts became more pressing in the course of the analysis, after I had analyzed politically eponymous, so to speak, parliamentary data, and realized the numerous discursive and ideological similarities between these data and Facebook discussions. In the data analysis section, I explain the analytical method I used and the coding scheme I devised – inductively, in Grounded Theory fashion – in order to determine these connections.

To anticipate, including online data did widen the range of people sampled to include actors not in the public spotlight. To a large degree, their perspectives proved to be very partisan. They did, however, speak in ways different than elected officials whose

discursive options were constrained by their respective political climates. Voices heard online, therefore, did merit sampling and inclusion.

Data for my study came from two among the numerous Facebook groups that sprouted up as early as November 2009, i.e., as soon as the Socialists officially announced the upcoming introduction of their *jus soli* bill. Facebook groups are created to share and discuss issues of common interest, and often to organize offline activity (Parks *et al.* 2009) – in this case, to bring together people for or against the *jus soli* bill, make a strong political statement on the existence of support or opposition to the bill, and promote offline political action. Among all the groups created explicitly in order to argue for or against the proposed law, I selected the two groups with the highest number of members and highest volume of discursive material. The two groups were named *No to nationality [ιθαγένεια] for foreigners in Greece* and *You become Greek; you are not born Greek*. Seeking to identify different voices articulated across the dialogues and the interactive (re)examination of national belonging, I collected discussion threads, rather than solitary wall posts. This data collection strategy resulted in 616 posts-dialogues; 470 in the pro-*jus soli* group and 146 in the one created to oppose the proposed bill. It is important to note that each group was “crashed” regularly by people who came to argue the opposite view. As a result, each group’s virtual wall hosted debates supporting a variety of positions. I read and analyzed all 616 texts.

III. DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

Upon collection, data were entered into a software engine for Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA), MAXQDA. This software package allows for sophisticated

development of codes (analytical labels) that are applied to texts. In some research, these analytical categories are known prior to analysis, and thus the analytical process is deductive and consists in applying the pre-existing coding scheme to the data collected. Data analysis for my study, however, followed the inductive process that leads to Grounded Theory (Corbin and Strauss 1998), wherein the concepts that become codes and are applied systematically to the data collected are found by analyzing the body of data itself. That is, they emerge from finding patterns in the early stages of the analysis, through the interaction with the first data segments tackled. Conceptual patterns are then turned into codes, applied to the data systematically, and usually revised depending on the insights yielded by further analysis, as the “big picture” gradually becomes evident. Once crystallized, the coding scheme is systematically applied to the data in their entirety. That is, the analytical process evolves in several rounds, as the researcher compares and relates new to old data, revises analytical labels, and (re-)applies them as needed to produce a coherent and uniform coding scheme. The first subsection below explicates this analytical process. Subsequently, I discuss the specifics of analyzing each data set individually. In the case of online data, I explicate the significance, as well as the process of tracing, to the degree possible, the online actors’ offline partisan and ideological links and proclivities.

Analytical Methodology

Much like the process of data collection, analysis for my study also followed the steps designed to lead to Grounded Theory (Corbin and Strauss 1998), i.e., theory “derived from data systematically gathered and analyzed through the research process” (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 12). As discussed above, this analytical method seeks out,

through a protracted process of minute interaction with the research material, the key patterns in the data, turns them into conceptual abstractions, which in qualitative data analysis are referred to as “codes,” and organizes the data by systematically applying the codes to those parts of the data set that engage these concepts.

This inductive analytical process corresponds to the key principle of the Grounded Theory research method. According to the pioneer grounded theorists I follow, Juliet Corbin and Anselm Strauss (1998), this principle is that, unless she aims to expand on existing theory, the researcher does not begin with a preconceived theory in mind. Rather, she selects a broad area of study and allows theory to emerge from the data; in other words, she *builds*, rather than *tests* theory. In my case, the idea that a nationalist worldview is not natural or universal, but contingent and contested had emerged through the casual observation of Greek debates on national issues, and had been reinforced by literature discussed in Chapter Two. In this sense, then, I did set out with a broad theoretical position, seeking to expand upon it. In terms, however, of understanding *how* people conceptualize collective belonging and adopt, reaffirm, challenge or reject nationalism, and what alternative schemes they propose, I did not set out with any pre-formed notion. Theory that addresses these questions was built overwhelmingly through my interaction with the data collected for my study. Thus, I did *not* approach or attempt to organize the data according to a pre-formed coding scheme derived from previous studies or devised prior to analysis to correspond to my research questions. Rather, a coding scheme corresponding to the main theoretical concepts I detected in the data emerged in the course of the analysis.

A second key feature of the analytical process designed to lead to Grounded Theory is that it is inherently comparative. Much like the objective of my study, which consists in finding the conceptual variation of Greeks' views on collective membership, Grounded Theory also aims to uncover the "range of variability" (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 143) in the concepts that emerge in the course of the analysis. To this end, the researcher compares each new data segment to ones already analyzed, both to potentially place new data within existing conceptual categories (codes), but also to examine whether and how they expand these categories' conceptual range.

In the paragraphs that follow, I explicate these processes of finding conceptual patterns, comparing data to uncover the variation in these patterns, and organizing the body of data systematically based on the conceptual scheme produced in the course of the analysis – a set of processes that Corbin and Strauss term "conceptual ordering" (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 15).

The Analytical Process

Open Coding

Analysis began with a detailed, line-by-line examination of the first data collected for my study. These data consist of the set of comments submitted to Opengov, the government-sponsored online public deliberation forum. "Open coding" (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 101) refers to the analytical process of gradually classifying similar phenomena under higher-order, abstract categories. Examples of the early stages of detecting such patterns and representing them as conceptual abstractions are available in the "memos" (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 110) I kept of the analytical process, i.e., the records of the researcher's thoughts and interpretations. Table 3-1 demonstrates such an

instance of detecting a conceptual pattern in the data at the very early stages of the data analysis.

Table 3-1 Open Coding Example

Data Segment	Memo Attached to Data
In text #2 of the Opengov data set, the comment argues that membership should be open only “to those who deserve it and can contribute to Greece.”	“This reminds me of something I read in Anna's ²⁸ articles – I think – about how migration issues are evaluated from the perspective of what benefits the host nation rather than the needs of the immigrants themselves.”
In text #16 of the Opengov data set, the author demands that, instead of hounding “the poor Greek” with all sorts of taxes, the government should take care to tax the billions of dollars lost daily through immigrants’ peddling activities.	“This falls into a category of arguments that seem to suggest that the interests of Greeks and immigrants are mutually exclusive.”
In text #162 of the Opengov data set, the author asks whether politicians plan to do something that will benefit Greeks. “Such rush for immigrants only? Is this a bill made by our Ministry of the Interior, or by a ministry of some other country?”	“This also juxtaposes the interests of Greeks and immigrants, perceives them as two distinct, homogeneous groups, and perceives the naturalization to be only in the interest of the immigrants, rather than something that affects/benefits society as a whole. Must perhaps create a theme on this, i.e., the perception of two distinct, separate, internally undifferentiated groups, Greeks and immigrants...”

As the table shows, in the first text-memo pair, a discursive segment encountered in the data evokes a theoretical concept encountered previously in the relevant literature. In the second, I have encountered this phenomenon enough to start thinking of it as “a category of arguments.” Several data segments later, the memo documents my decision to treat this discourse as a “theme,” i.e., a recurring pattern in the data and therefore an analytical label (code) to be applied when the pattern is encountered. Further and as

²⁸ The memo’s “Anna” is nationalism and migration scholar Anna Triandafyllidou, who served as a member of my doctoral committee.

stated earlier, the analytical goal of Grounded Theory is not only to detect central patterns in the data, but also to conceptualize and represent them as theoretical abstractions. These memos demonstrate my initial attempts at such a translation. For example, I use the terms “benefits” and “interests” to represent what my respondents are saying in more abstract language. To anticipate, the theme first detected here gradually evolved, through the course of analysis, into the conceptual category I named “Resources,” which I describe in the “Findings” section farther into this chapter. The issue I raise in the third memo, of people perceiving Greeks and immigrants as “two distinct, separate, internally undifferentiated groups” evolved into a sub-code, or *property*, of “Resources” dealing with whether their “Allocation” (i.e., what I named this sub-code) should be based on ethnic membership or other criteria.

Theoretical Coding

As I explained in the earlier discussion of Grounded Theory, the analytical process it dictates is inherently comparative, because it aims to detect and show the range of variation in the concepts that emerge in the course of the analysis. To this end, when the researcher detects a pattern in the data and represents it as an abstract theoretical concept, she examines and defines it in terms of what Corbin and Strauss (1998) call a concept’s *properties*; in other words the characteristics along which a category may exhibit variation. For example, a central pattern that emerged in the data for my dissertation was discussion on the phenomenon of people moving across international borders, a pattern I represented abstractly as “cross-border mobility.” Discussions on cross-border mobility included, among other things, whether people tend primarily to move or to remain sedentary, as well as whether their moving produces positive or

negative social outcomes. Cross-border mobility, then, exhibited variation along the properties I termed “normality” and “productivity.” Consequently, as soon as I detected enough instances of people discussing the concept of mobility and representing it as, among other things, normal (or abnormal), I began looking for variation within the concepts already detected.

This method of coding on the basis of concepts and how they may vary along certain properties is termed “theoretical” (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 88). In other words, the researcher examines data on the basis of existing concepts and their properties in order to detect sameness and variation and thus expand the categories’ conceptual range. Open and theoretical coding do not take place in a linear order. The coding process becomes theoretical as soon as the researcher discovers in the data a conceptual category and the properties along which it exhibits variation. Yet coding also remains open in the sense that the researcher is always on the lookout for potential new categories or new properties of categories already detected. In this process, the conceptual scheme and its corresponding analytical labels (codes) may be revised one or more times, depending on the insights the researcher gradually gains in the course of the analysis. Analysis stops when categories are “saturated” (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 136), i.e., when no new information seems to emerge in the data, or when new information does not seem to add much to the purposes of the research.

In order to detect conceptual variation, Grounded Theory recommends that researchers obtain multiple representations of the issue at hand from multiple actors, places and occasions. The section on data collection discussed how I maximized variation in my sample in terms of social actors, discursive fora, and types of collective debate. In

the next section, I discuss how these diverse data were analyzed based on their specific features, as well as how they contributed to my study's findings. Data were grouped into sets and distributed into corresponding files in the analytical software (MAXQDA) according first to the capacity of social actors whose voices were captured for my study and second to the discursive fora or occasions where they articulated their views. Politicians' voices, for example, were grouped together into one file, whether they spoke in the National Assembly or expressed their views in opinion columns hosted in newspapers.

Data Sets

Online Fora

Opengov

The first data set collected and analyzed was the set of submissions to Opengov. As mentioned in the section on data collection, this website was created by the governing Socialists to elicit public commentary on proposed legislation. All 3,403 comments submitted to the site between December 28, 2009 and January 7, 2010 were copied and pasted into a MAXQDA file, each submission corresponding to one MAXQDA text. Because these comments did not derive from a random sample of the general population under study, but rather were voluntarily submitted, I did not draw a random sub-sample for analysis. Rather, I *started* reading comments in their order of submission. This made sense analytically, because, in this process of posting comments online, much like below an article on a newspaper's site, it is not unusual for people to reference other, previously submitted, comments in their argumentation. After reading through and conducting a preliminary analysis of the first 370 texts, however, it became evident that most of these

early comments had been submitted in order to oppose the legislative initiative. I discuss this orchestrated, partisan posting campaign in the next paragraph – what is important here is that it resulted in comments and ideas so similar, that it did not make sense to look for variation by continuing to read postings in their sequential order of submission. To enhance detection of any possible variation in the submissions, I began to read and analyze comments in a random order; in other words, I scrolled through the selection of submissions and landed on texts randomly. I continued to do this until new data did not seem to yield any new insights, either in terms of new conceptual categories or variation in the ones already detected. In this process of selecting texts randomly, I ignored submissions that were very similar, conceptually and often verbally, to what I had encountered numerous times, particularly comments opposing the proposed law, and focused mostly on comments in support of the bill that widened the conceptual scope. I also excluded comments submitted by – to the best of my knowledge and judging from the commenters’ self-identification – immigrants. These were excluded, because the research population for my dissertation is limited to Greeks and expressly does not include the opinions of immigrants. In total, I read and analyzed 438 posts from this dataset.

Comments posted on Opengov were impossible to match with their authors’ demographics, as attaching one’s name to the comment posted was optional. What’s more, those names or other indications of one’s identity or affiliation, such as web addresses, that were attached were impossible to verify. As mentioned above, however, after reading through and conducting a preliminary analysis of the first 370 texts, it became evident that the comments submitted to oppose the legislative initiative were

significantly more numerous than those submitted to support it. More specifically, from the 370 first comments submitted, all within the first forty-eight hours since the forum opened, only 36, i.e., less than ten percent, were in support of the proposed legislation. Newspapers²⁹ reported this posting process as an orchestrated campaign by the political Right, particularly the far Right, to foster an impression of mass opposition against the *jus soli* bill. The mass, highly repetitive (often verbatim) early posting also supports this conclusion. Meanwhile, the pro-*jus soli* camp, replete with its own diverse partisan and ideological affiliations to the governing Socialists or to various civil and political groups of the Left, also allegedly stepped up to meet their opponents' online crusade, making other sides of the debate available.

At the time these comments were being submitted, Opengov was the flagship in the Socialists' much-touted mission to institute processes of “open governance” [ανοιχτή διακυβέρνηση]. Apart from a commitment to post all legislative and administrative acts and procedures online and thus open them to public scrutiny, the site introduced a process of public deliberation [δημόσια διαβούλευση] on proposed pieces of legislation prior to the voting process – the idea behind this being that legislators would take into account the public sentiment and make corresponding changes in the bills before submitting them for vote. Indeed, normative literature defines “deliberative democracy” as “a form of government in which free and equal citizens, including elected representatives justify decisions in a process in which they give one another reasons that are mutually acceptable and generally accessible, with the aim of reaching conclusions that are binding

²⁹ This includes all the newspapers from where I retrieved articles for this study, except for *ProtoThema* which took Opengov posting at face value (Savvidis 2010). What is more, *Eleftherotypia* reported that, among the first 350 comments submitted to oppose the bill, 100 were posted from the same IP address (*Eleftherotypia* 2010).

in the present on all citizens but open to challenge in the future” (Gutmann and Thompson 2004: 7). Deliberation on decisions affecting the collective body was for a long time confined to the few. What is meant to make deliberation democratic is the expansion of the pool of people included in the process (Gutmann and Thompson 2004) – through an online forum accessible to the mass public, for example. Yet, to the degree that I was able to gauge given the repetitive character of posting and the newspaper accounts cited above, Opengov did not host the opinions of the many who would otherwise not be heard. Rather, the site hosted highly partisan perspectives whose purpose was, more than anything else, to create an impression of mass opposition or, conversely, mass support for the legislative initiative. Tangentially to the purposes of my dissertation, this empirical case belies the claim made in normative literature, such as the work by Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson (2004) cited above, that processes of deliberative democracy encourage a consideration of issues on their own merits, as well as bargaining based on moral reasons rather than on the basis of partisan power.

Because the set of comments submitted to Opengov was the first set of data tackled, its analysis yielded early versions of most conceptual categories. Yet most of the submissions I read and analyzed from this site leaned toward the more nationalist, essentialist, exclusionary side of the conceptual and discursive spectrum. Facebook data discussed in the next subsection expanded the conceptual range considerably toward the opposite direction.

Facebook

Facebook data were analyzed directly after Opengov data. As discussed in the section on data collection, Facebook data consist of a total of 616 conversations on the

virtual walls of two groups, one selected because it was created to support and the other to oppose the proposed *jus soli* legislation. Similar to the Opengov data, all postings were entered into one MAXDQA file. Each conversation was entered as one MAXQDA text within that file, and conversations from each Facebook group were placed together as one MAXQDA text group. (That is, the software allows for a subdivision of texts which links them as belonging to the same source.)

As explained earlier, the analysis of Opengov data had already revealed most of the major categories that comprise my study's conceptual scheme – even if it had not developed them to their full conceptual range. All data analyzed after Opengov, therefore, were submitted mostly to theoretical coding. In other words, they were examined mostly in terms of how they varied from – or were similar to – theoretical insights yielded by data already analyzed. As with Opengov, postings by people self identified as immigrants were excluded from the analysis.

Apart from its conceptual analysis, however, Facebook content was also examined in terms of tracing, to the extent possible, accurate and clear links between online participants and their discourses and the offline partisan and ideological formations in which they partook. As I stated in the section on data collection, I did not, with few exceptions, set out to identify individual participants. For those few cases, however, I relied on the insights of literature that argues that personal information provided in Facebook profiles is most likely complete and accurate (Acquisti and Gross 2006), particularly because people usually interact with members of their offline social networks, a fact that compels honest self-presentation (Donath and boyd 2004; boyd and Ellison 2007).

Online discussants' offline links were detected in the following ways. First, the overall partisan or ideological orientation of a Facebook group or its individual members was gauged and coded in terms of the ways discussions on the prospect of *jus soli* mapped the issue onto intra-Greek ideological, partisan and social divides; "Intra-Greek Divides" emerged as a central concept in all the data analyzed for my study, and is explicated in the "Findings" section of this chapter. Discussions in the pro-*jus soli* Facebook group described opponents to the law as people whose nationalist notions verged on the pathological. Direct and frequent attacks were made against the leader of the center-Right, Antonis Samaras, denounced as a populist and parochial nationalist, the leader of the far-Right, and various members of both parties. Discussions also included Golden Dawn and whether the neo-Nazi party and its activities should be outlawed. Further, opposition to the proposed law was represented as a mark of low education and phobic nationalist hysteria. In the anti-*jus soli* group, particular wrath was directed against the governing Socialists, but also against political formations of the Left within or outside the Parliament and against the political system in its entirety, mainstream media, labor unions, traditionally affiliated to the Socialists, that include immigrants in their ranks, NGOs, grassroots organizations, and an entire category of "pseudo-intellectuals," harnessed to the cause of multiculturalism and hostile toward national symbols, borders and narratives.

Second, Facebook content was coded for the political action, on or offline, its members advocated. In the pro-*jus soli* Facebook group, members encouraged each other to continue their offline and online activity "against fascism," even after the passage of the *jus soli* bill. While the bill's passage was still pending, members urged each other to

participate in offline pro-immigrant events and rallies, and support members of the second generation facing deportation. In the anti-*jus soli* Facebook group, the offline political activity promoted more often and more intensely by regular discussants was a rally organized by the neo-Nazi Golden Dawn party to commemorate the anniversary of the January 31, 1996 near-debacle between Greece and Turkey prevented at the last minute by an alleged United States' behind-the-scenes intervention, but which nevertheless cost the lives of three Greek pilots. What stands out here is the way in which these online discussants represented this event and their participation in it. This leads into the third way in which I coded Facebook content, namely for the ways in which online discussants spoke about either their own or the group's ideological identifications. In the anti-*jus soli* Facebook group, regular discussants spoke openly of their association with the far-Right LAOS party. What emerged as more interesting, however, was the ways in which they treated the possibility of their affiliation to "fascism" in general or to the neo-Nazi Golden Dawn in particular. In promoting participation to the Golden Dawn's event, these online discussants argued that people rallying there should only hold Greek flags, for example, rather than the banner of any political party. "Fascists," they said, may also participate, because they are also members of the Greek nation, but the event should be one for Greeks across the political spectrum. Besides, they argued, labeling "ordinary" Greek patriots as fascists is but "a provocative tactic of the system" that seeks to delegitimize nationalist views and practices.

Finally, I coded Facebook content for the presence of regular discussants with explicit affiliations to political parties, particularly elected officials or people who had run for office. This emerged as more salient in the case of the group created in support of

jus soli, whose discussants included candidates, elected national representatives, or prominent members from the ranks of the Radical Left, but also people that had run for office with Greece's two small liberal parties, *Drasi* and *Fileleutheri Summachia*, which were not represented in the Parliament. Further, it included activists and prominent members of NGOs (or the even official Facebook profiles or pages of NGOs), including the Greek branches of international or European organizations, such as the Helsinki Monitor, or grassroots Greek organizations mostly affiliated to the Radical Left, such as the Sunday School for Immigrants [*Κυριακάτικο Σχολείο Μεταναστών*]. This is where the insights gained from the literature on the verifiability of Facebook profiles discussed above came in particularly handy. These people's profiles, which included photographs and personal information, as well as their networks of connections, which most often overlapped with my own and thus acted as implicit warrantors of the information included in their profiles, enable me to make these claims.

The group created in opposition to *jus soli* did not feature public figures among its main discussants, or people I could recognize based on a shared network of online or offline connections, except for one prominent discussant whose (open) Facebook profile identified him officially as a member of the Greek National Front [*Εθνικό Μέτωπο*], a marginal far-Right political formation. To situate the anti-*jus soli* group in offline contexts, then, I relied much more on the rest of the indicators described in this section.

In conclusion, these groups' offline contexts confirm the claim that Patricia Ehrkamp and Helga Leitner (2003) make in their examination of the German debate on national boundaries – namely, that nationality is negotiated between the state and its official agents and institutions, and civil society (conceptualized here broadly to include

people whose capacities and engagement may also extend to the formal political sphere). In the case I examine in my dissertation, members of the Greek civil society harnessed these new technologies to disseminate their political message. To summarize the two groups' offline contexts and affiliations, the group created in support of the bill concentrated an assortment of social actors ranging in their ideological and partisan ties from the modernizing, Europeanist, liberal-democratic center and center Left to the radical, Marxist Left within and outside the Parliament (on the partisan and ideological affiliation of Greek anti-nationalist actors see also Vasilaki 2010). Boundary-making discourses articulated on the "wall" of this group loosely correspond to what deputies of the Radical Left (SYRIZA) said in their parliamentary addresses – yet Facebook discussions were considerably more detailed and explicit, offering a wealth of data. On the other end of the ideological spectrum, the group created to oppose the legislative initiative concentrated actors affiliated to various formations of the off-center political Right, ranging from the far-Right LAOS party represented at the time in the Greek National Assembly to the neo-Nazi Golden Dawn, which had yet to emerge from the political margins. Dialogues in the anti-*jus soli* Facebook group did not contribute to widening the conceptual spectrum any farther than Opengov data already had – they did, however, serve to confirm the anti-*jus soli* discursive and conceptual patterns already detected.

Official Political Discourses

The next body of data was culled from the record of discussions regarding the *jus soli* legislation which took place in the Greek National Assembly. This dataset also includes a speech by the Prime Minister, George Papandreou, at the Global Forum on

Migration and Development on November 4 2009, in which he formally announced his government's upcoming legislative initiative. Further, the dataset includes two formal statements by the head of the center-Right party, Antonis Samaras, republished verbatim in the newspaper *Eleftherotypia*. All data were entered into one MAXQDA file. Each parliamentary discussion was entered as one text, as was each of Samaras' articles as well as Papandreou's speech. Thereafter, the data was analyzed using the methods already indicated above. Given that this data set was the penultimate to be analyzed, the analysis proceeded quickly given that the notions articulated in these documents had already become quite clear to the researcher.

Newspapers

As stated in the section that explained the rationale guiding data collection for my dissertation, four newspapers were chosen for their mass, nationwide circulation, as well as for the fact that their editorial profiles span the Left-Right ideological spectrum. Content from each newspaper was entered into one MAXQDA file, and each article was entered as one text. Articles retrieved were analyzed in Grounded Theory fashion, as all data collected for my study, following the same coding approach. A subset of these opinion articles were written by public intellectuals advocating national membership for immigrants. Given that these were written by this specific category of social actors, they were analyzed together as one discrete set of data. The rest of the articles retrieved were classified as news, features, or commentary³⁰.

³⁰ On the basis of my own academic and professional background in Journalism, I classify as news those articles that simply tell readers the news, without going in depth or offering opinions, as features those that elaborate on a piece of news, offering background information or the human-interest aspect of the story, and as opinion those that are explicitly written in order to offer the writer's opinion on an issue.

Table 3-2 Newspaper Articles by Genre

Type of Article	News	Feature	Commentary
<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	93	51	39
<i>To Vima</i>	50	16	21
<i>I Kathimerini</i>	29	20	31
<i>Proto Thema</i>	17	11	9

IV. FINDINGS

Introduction

This section offers a list of the main conceptual categories that had emerged by the time the analytical process was complete. In other words, through several rounds of analysis I produced a uniform conceptual scheme that reflected the patterns within and variation among all data analyzed for my dissertation. Here, I list and describe these categories (bolded), as well as the properties along which they exhibit conceptual variation (enumerated below the category to which they belong). In a few cases, categories merited subdivision into subcategories, and these are provided below the broader category. Properties apply to them as they do to the broad category. Categories, subcategories and properties correspond to the analytical labels, or *codes*, applied to the data during the analytical process.

Conceptual Categories and their Properties

Cross-Border Mobility

Data coded under this label consist in conversations on the broader concept of human mobility that entails people crossing international borders and staying away from their state of origin permanently or indefinitely.

Properties and Conceptual Variation

(1) Normality: Is it human nature and a universal pattern to be on the move or to be sedentary? What causes movement?

(2) Productivity: Does cross-border mobility produce positive or negative social outcomes? Data segments coded here particularly negotiate the productive or destructive effects of mobility in terms of the inter-ethnic contact and plurality it effects.

(3) Volume and Order/Control: Is movement into Greece (and Europe) at this particular socio-historical instance excessive or numerically acceptable? Do people move in a manner that the host state is able to regulate and control, or is movement chaotic and disorderly? What are the prospective effects of the pending *jus soli* legislation on the volume and patterns of movement into Greece (and Europe)?

(4) Legality: Should states have the authority to characterize human mobility across international borders as “legal” or “illegal?” Are documented immigrants more entitled to nationality than undocumented ones?

Ethno-Cultural Mixture/Plurality/Co-Existence

Much like “cross-border mobility,” this conceptual category also encompasses a broader discussion – which framed, in a way, the more specific issue at hand – on the normality and effects of people with different ethnic traits living within the same political

body. People spoke of biological mixture, as well as mixture and plurality in terms of cultural patterns.

Properties and Conceptual Variation

Variation occurred along the following two properties, which correspond strongly to the same properties described above under the “Cross-Border Mobility” conceptual category.

(1) Normality: Are ethno-cultural mixture, plurality and co-existence normal and universal human patterns – in other words, have people always tended to mix? Or are they aberrant (because ethno-national “cultures” are distinct entities that do not mix), and currently caused by the contemporary, globalization-induced circumstances of increased mobility?

(2) Productivity: Consequently, do mixture and plurality produce positive social outcomes, i.e., reinvigorated social bodies, or do they threaten cultural patterns with adulteration, and cause social discord?

Ethno-Cultural Content/Features/Identity

This concept/code encompasses discussions on the corpus of ethnic traits that each ethno-national group possesses. It was diversely represented as “customs and mores,” traditions, language as well as the nebulous notion of “Greekness.”

Properties and Conceptual Variation

(1) Adoptability: Are ethnic features something that people may acquire through their enculturation in a new ethnic context? In other words, are ethnic features changeable – can people shed their existing ones and acquire new?

(2) Saliency: This reflects the degree of importance of a shared ethno-cultural as a criterion for political (national) membership. Should immigrants be expected or required to adopt the host country's dominant ethnic idiom (i.e., to assimilate) in order to be considered for membership? Should all people in the same body politic display the same cultural patterns? Or is ethnic content irrelevant to political belonging?

“Europeanness”

This analytical label encompasses discursive segments that posited a rigid boundary between (Western) Europe – and Greece, represented as an indisputably European nation – and immigrants' countries of origins, either from Asia and Africa, or from countries of the European “periphery” (e.g., Adamovsky 2005; Todorova 1997), notably from the former Communist Bloc. The term “*Europeanness*” (Hesse 2007: 646, emphasis in the original) is borrowed from the literature, and denotes hegemonic discourses that represent Europe (and Greece, in this case) as the home of “whiteness” and Christianity, and bundle everyone else in a culturally inferior category. In my data, Islam and its faithful were represented as the essential Other, who may not be included in European national communities. On the antipode, people castigated such discourses as racist, and sought to highlight social structures of inequality and exclusion instead.

Ethnic Descent (Ethnicity)

This analytical label encompasses discussions on ethnic descent, both as a concept and as a criterion for national membership. Apart from the set of sub-codes corresponding to the concept's properties, segments coded under “ethnic descent” were divided depending on whether people represented descent as biological, cultural, a legal norm (*jus sanguinis*), or used the term/concept without specifying what they meant by it.

These analytical labels correspond to what Corbin and Strauss call “subcategories” (1998: 101), and were applied here to reflect the fact that people understood and defined ethnic descent differently.

Subcategories

(1) Undefined: Segments coded under this analytical label were the discourses of people who used the notion of ethnic descent without explaining what they meant by it, i.e., people that spoke of descent as a common-sense notion that does not require conceptualization.

(2) Biological: Segments coded here were the discourses of people who defined Greek ethnic descent as sharing the same blood.

(3) Cultural: This label was applied to commentaries that posited ethnic descent as the passing down and sharing of language, customs and traditions; most such segments expressly opposed a biological understanding of ethnicity.

(4) Legal Norm: This label was applied to commentaries that defined ethnic descent as a legal norm – either in opposition to biological or cultural understandings, or as a legal principle that confirms the salience of biological or cultural descent to national membership.

Properties and Conceptual Variation

Data segments coded under “ethnic descent” and one or more of the subcategories listed above exhibited conceptual variation along the following properties:

(1) Salience: Much like “ethno-cultural content,” discussions coded here debated the degree of importance of ethnic descent, however defined, as a criterion for national membership.

(2) Conceptual Validity: Data coded under this label correspond to discursive segments that indicated whether people deployed the notion of “ethnic descent” as a valid concept, or whether they attempted to point out its conceptual contradictions.

Ithageneia versus Ipikootita

This label was applied to discursive segments that objected to the granting of *ithageneia* to immigrants, and proposed that they should be granted *ipikootita* instead, as well as to arguments countering this objection. *Ithageneia* is the Greek legal term for nationality, and is used officially rather than its synonymous term *ipikootita*, whose etymology evokes membership in the political rather than in the ethno-national unit. *Ithageneia*, on the other hand, comprises the term “*genus*,” which, as Chapter Two explained, has strong ethnic connotations. I have taken conversations coded under “*ithageneia versus ipikootita*” to constitute an additional field of debate on the salience and the conceptual validity of ethnic descent as a criterion of political membership.

Omogeneis versus Immigrants

This label was applied to conversations that juxtaposed immigrants’ claims to national membership with the claims of (1) ethnic Greeks who have moved to Greece from Albania and the former Soviet Union since the 1980s, and (2) Greek emigrants (e.g., to the United States) and their descendants. I have taken these conversations to constitute an additional field of debate on the salience of “ethnic descent” versus “stakeholding” as criteria for collective membership.

Stakeholding

Data segments coded here correspond to the “the principle of stakeholding” (e.g., Bauböck *et al.* 2006: 19) – in other words, the notion that national membership should be

granted on the basis of the degree to which prospective members, whatever their ethnic or cultural traits, have linked their fates to that of the collective unit and developed “vital ties” (e.g., Christopoulos 2012: 170) to it. For first-generation immigrants, this may refer to the fact that have developed stakes in the host society through, for example, owning property, investing, developing professional networks, or raising their children in Greece. For the second generation, stakeholding translates into their experience of growing up in Greece, speaking Greek as their main language, interacting with Greeks during their formative years, going through the Greek school system, and therefore being socialized and prepared to build a life in Greece, rather than their parents’ country of origin. Others facets of stakeholding are the social ties that people develop as friends, neighbors, colleagues or school mates – i.e., people who share the same daily reality and issues – and which may supersede ethno-cultural differences, or the sentiment of belonging and the choice to belong to the Greek collective unit. Differentiation within data coded under “stakeholding” occurred in terms of which segments of the collective unit people tie their fates to, and the kind of social attributes, beliefs and behaviors that should be viewed as indicative of such adherence. Members of the Communist Party, for example, argued that the key tie was that of class, in the sense that they considered belonging to be crafted more around common class than ethnicity; they argued, therefore, that membership in the country’s labor force and participation in its wealth production entitled immigrants to political membership. Others invoked immigrants’ contribution to Greece as grounds for membership and as an indicator of their adherence to the collective; they argued primarily that immigrants had provided cheap labor for blue-collar jobs the natives would not do, such as work in the agriculture or construction industries – the latter particularly

in preparation for the 2004 Olympics. The “good” civic behavior of immigrants, such as paying their taxes diligently, was invoked as further proof as well as grounds for membership, and often contrasted to the “poor” behavior of Greeks themselves. Segments coded under “stakeholding” that referred to immigrants’ contribution or “good” civic behavior were closely related to, and often also coded under the next major code, “collective resources.”

Collective Resources

This concept encompasses a prominent tendency in the data to negotiate membership in terms of the resources that the collective body possesses – more specifically, about who should have the right to enjoy these resources, but also how immigrants’ membership affects these resources.

Subcategories

- (1) Jobs and public benefits
- (2) Decision-making power
- (3) Social cohesion, order, solidarity, and allegiance
- (4) Democracy, justice, equality, and the rule of law

Properties and Conceptual Variation

- (1) Availability (Scarcity versus Abundance): Are collective resources enough to suffice for both Greeks and immigrants?
- (2) Allocation: Should collective resources be allocated on the basis of one’s ethnicity – in other words, should Greeks enjoy priority access? Or are other criteria (such as stakeholding) more salient?

(3) Migration's/Bill's Effect on Collective Resources: Does the presence of immigrants or their acquisition of Greek nationality enhance or diminish the pool of resources?

Nationality as a Right

This analytical label was applied to data segments that negotiated whether full membership into a political community consists in a *right* – either because nationality is the main means to civil, social, and political rights, or a right gained as a result of people's long-term residence in and the ties they have developed to the political community. On the antipode to this view, bill opponents argued that the government may protect immigrants' social, civil and political rights in other ways – what constitutes a right is the right of Greeks to preserve the ethnic character of their political community.

Referendum

This code was applied to a debate raised by the far Right's request that the issue of immigrant membership be put on a national referendum for Greeks to decide whether they wish to expand the boundaries of their political community. Conceptually, conversations coded under this label are closely related to the concept of “membership as a right,” but also to the notion of “democracy, justice, equality, and the rule of law” as a set of collective resources that the inclusion or exclusion of immigrants stands to affect.

Intra-Greek Divides

This code was applied to discursive segments that linked refers to how the issue of national membership for immigrants was mapped onto with existing intra-Greek divides. In other words, how people would represent their own or their opponents' views as resulting from their partisan (i.e., party affiliation), ideological, or class (education and wealth) leanings.

The Range of Voices

As stated throughout these first three chapters, the research objective, which guided data collection and analysis, was to uncover the *range* of publicly articulated views on collective membership, and thus problematize the representation of nationalism as the normal, or even natural, model of social organization. To reiterate, my study conceptualizes nationalism as the belief that the ethnic and the political units must coincide (Gellner 1983; Hobsbawm 1990). In the course of my data analysis, it became apparent that views could be grouped into three major camps, depending (1) on the degree to which they reaffirmed or challenged key tenets of the nationalist ideology and (2) on the boundary schemes they proposed. After this immediate discussion, I will refer to them primarily as “voices” in my dissertation. The first is the nationalist camp; i.e., the set of people who argued against membership for immigrants, and premised collective belonging on ethnicity and hegemonic definitions of what it means to be Greek. These are the voices that occupied the nationalist end of the spectrum on the conceptual range of each of the categories and their properties outlined above. The second camp consists of those voices that sought to expand the nation’s boundaries to include immigrants, but argued in ways that reproduced a nationalist worldview. In other words, they mitigated the key tenets of nationalism enough to argue for the inclusion of immigrants in the national community, but did not challenge nationalism at its core. Finally, the third camp consists of people who attacked nationalism at its core by seeking to divorce political belonging from ethnicity altogether, and instead premised membership on participation in the political unit’s social, economic and decision-making

processes. These are the voices that occupied the least nationalist end of the spectrum on the conceptual range of each of the categories and their properties.

Before proceeding to the next subsection, I must note that my scheme of three main voices, which (1) reaffirm, (2) dispute yet reproduce, and (3) fundamentally challenge the nationalist worldview was also proposed by Per Gustafson (2005) in his examination of Swedish debates on whether immigrants should be able to have dual nationality.

Presentation of Findings in the Data Chapters

Discussion in the data chapters that follow is structured to reflect my more nuanced analysis of data from these three different camps. In each chapter, I examine how people articulating these different views tend to cluster around concepts in regular ways. Chapter Four discusses how each of the different camps negotiated the concepts of cross-border mobility, ethno-cultural mixture, and Europeanness. Chapter Five does the same in terms of the concepts of ethnic descent, ethno-cultural content and stakeholding, and also examines conversations that juxtaposed the membership prospects of immigrants to those of ethnic Greeks and emigrants, as well as the “*ithageneia* versus *ipikootita*” debate. Chapter Six examines my research question through the lens of citizenship, i.e., through the sum of rights and responsibilities that national membership confers (Bauböck *et al.* 2006: 2). Chapter Seven concludes my study by arguing for the academic as well as the social significance of my findings.

Discussion in each data chapter begins with a dialogue mined from the pro-*jus soli* Facebook group. This choice reflects the fact that discussions on this group’s virtual wall hosted polarized but also nuanced debates among actors significantly diverse in

terms of their opinions³¹; debates which allow the reader to observe the range of differentiation in people's views. Throughout each chapter, I anchor my argumentation on more illustrative data segments that exemplify specific aspects of the topic. The voices of elected officials launch most discussions, in order to evince the fact that the conceptual differentiation I encountered in my research mapped almost neatly onto political and ideological fault lines. Subsequently, I juxtapose the voices of national representatives with the voices of online discussants³², journalists, and public intellectuals, to demonstrate how issues were represented by different types of actors, as well as in different discursive contexts (the National Assembly, pages of newspapers, or online fora). It is important to note that all the conversations I examine in my dissertation took place from August 2009 to March 2010. In my data chapters, then, when I specify the date that a specific statement, comment, or dialogue was made or took place, I omit the year – in conversations that took place August through December, the year was 2009, and in conversations that took place January through March, the year was 2010.

Discussion in the data chapters closely follows the scheme of conceptual categories and their properties outlined above. I discuss each conceptual category in terms of its properties, and present the different viewpoints along the range of differentiation of each property – viewpoints that largely correspond to each of three sets of “voices” explained above. After I examine each viewpoint, I provide tables that

³¹ More specifically, the *pro-jus soli* group received significantly more visits on its wall by people who came to argue the opposite position. People who joined Facebook to argue in favor of the proposed law tended to stay and discuss in their own group only, whereas the bill's opponents paid frequent visits to the *pro-jus soli* group in order to engage in debate.

³² When I reproduce online discursive segments, I maintain most of the original punctuation and capitalization patterns in order to transmit the sentiment that writers themselves were trying to transmit when submitting their comments.

systematically contextualize it, by giving detailed information on its frequency and distribution in my data – in other words, on how prevalent it was and who its main proponents were. The primary goal of QDA in general and Grounded Theory in particular is *not* to quantify data, i.e., measure the distribution of persons along the conceptual range of a category and its properties, but rather to identify categories, explore their conceptual range and variation, and examine their relationships (Corbin and Strauss 1998: 11). Yet it is also imperative to substantiate that research findings are presented in a balanced and systematic manner, particularly given the highly contested nature of the topic examined in my dissertation, as well as my own unquestionable embeddedness in its conflictual politics. For example, when I argue that a certain viewpoint was central to the argumentation of a specific political party, or appeared mostly in the pages of a specific newspaper, it is important to substantiate this assertion by showing how frequently the argument was articulated by the party's representatives or appeared on the newspaper's pages, also in comparison with how frequently or infrequently it was voiced by other groups or categories of social actors included in my data. I now proceed to these discussions.

Chapter 4: Debates on Mobility and Mixture

I. INTRODUCTION

“You will allow me,” the Viper wrote, “[...]”³³to set forth exactly what one must do in order to reside and work in Spain, even as a national of another EU member-state, not as an illegal immigrant.”

The text that followed, allegedly a letter written by a Greek living in Spain, described a strenuous, tightly controlled documentation process, including, among other things, cross-checks of the prospective immigrant’s criminal records with national and international law enforcement agencies, medical examinations for contagious diseases such as hepatitis, tuberculosis and HIV, and residence and work permits finally granted along with a firm threat of deportation, were the immigrant to commit any criminal offences during his first year in the host state.

“I ask then,” the Viper continued, “my deeply democratic fellow Greeks [συνέλληνες]: In Greece, who among the illegal immigrants would go through the above-stated process successfully?”

The woman, who added “Viper” after her first name as part of her online name³⁴, wrote this on January 8 on the virtual wall of the Facebook group created to back the

³³ The “Viper” wrote this in response to a link another discussant had posted above. Yet, by the time this data was collected, the link was no longer operative.

³⁴ Unless one’s Facebook identity is glaringly fake, I assume the person has given her or his true information. Because Facebook discussions on the “wall” of an open group are public, I refer to people with their given first names, but do not use last names. The person in question gave her first name as Eleni, which is a female name, and added the nickname “Oxia” next to it, written in the Latin alphabet. In the *Greeklish* transliteration system, used by many Greeks in their informal, online communications, “Oxia” may be read either as “Ochia” [Οχιά], which translates into “viper,” or as “Oksia” [Οξιά] which translates into “beech.” The regular members of the group she “crashed,” given the virulence of their discussions with her, preferred the first version, and addressed her as “Viper” (many writing it in the Greek alphabet). Consequently, I also got to “know” her as such. Interestingly, “the Viper” did not bother to correct them.

governing Socialists' *jus soli* legislative initiative. In what has in recent years become a regular phenomenon in Facebook groups that are created to support one side in a contested issue, the woman, who gave her actual name as Eleni, joined not to add herself to the number of people aligned behind the group's cause, but rather to argue the opposite position. The dialogue sparked by her comment and reproduced below introduces a topic that emerged as central in the discussions on the issue of immigrant membership.

“My good woman, why do you keep talking about ILLEGAL immigrants?????????” Maria, one of the group's most regular members, responded to the Viper's comment. “When will you realize we are talking about IMMIGRANTS????????????????? You talk, you talk, you talk... but you do not read anything, it seems to me... START “LISTENING” IMMEDIATELY... FOR MERCY'S SAKE, ELENI... [...]”

“Therefore, my dear Eleni, WE ARE ALL IMMIGRANTS...” another somewhat usual discussant, Polyxeni, pitched in, drawing on the fact that, as the Viper's example indicated, Greeks also have to endure challenging entry and documentation processes, when they try to emigrate, even to a fellow EU member-state.

“Whether you want it or not,” the Viper continued in response to Maria, “they are, according to Greek and EU laws, ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS!!! Greece has NEVER

When another group member pointed out the ambiguity and double meaning, Eleni admitted it was deliberate on her part, but did not deign to demand that people favor the “beech” version instead; their choice was “not [her] problem,” she said.

OFFICIALLY requested any immigrants by any state, even less so from the countries³⁵ where they have come from!”

At this point in the discussion, one of the group’s administrators, whose frequent postings indicated that she was trained in law and therefore addressed most of the legal issues that emerged in the group’s discussions, Elina-Stella, interfered to demonstrate that, far from opening national membership to any and all immigrants, the proposed law instituted a rigorous process with multiple checks and conditions. To counter the Viper’s example, she cited a long excerpt from the *jus soli* bill, showing that it contained a series of conditions for first-generation immigrants, including, among others, requirements that applicants hold a clean criminal record, legal residence for at least five years and a series of documents and administrative processes verifying compliance with these and other requirements.

“Truly, you consider all of the above automatic, simple and easy? Elina-Stella addressed her online interlocutors, adding that her question was “rhetorical.”

“‘Greece has never officially requested any immigrants by any state, even less so from the countries where they have come from!’ NOOOOOO, my dear Viper, you are not a racist at all,” Polyxeni wrote, re-entering the discussion, “you just forget we are talking about humans... in whose place you could be as well! But what am I saying... you are of a superior race, and you accept only immigrants of high birth!!!! Unfortunately for you, they have no reason to migrate...” Polyxeni scorned, alluding to the ethno-racial hierarchies that largely inform debates on who may migrate to Greece and potentially

³⁵ Refers to the source countries of Greece’s immigrant population at the time. Briefly, these are countries of the former Communist Bloc, mostly Albania, but also and in more recent years countries in Southeast Asia and sub-Saharan Africa (Triandafyllidou and Maroukis 2010).

become a national. “You know what I think all of you *Ellinarades*³⁶ suffer from???? A lack of love!!!!... SO LOVE EACH OTHER!!!!!”

“Whatever, Polyxeni,” the Viper responded, resuming her argumentation. “When you wake up from your righteous sleep, you will realize that human relations and a country’s interests are two completely different things. A country is not a human being. I should assume, then, that you love everything and everyone, your house is open to all, you share your food and your income with as many as you can. As strange as it may seem to you, I am not a racist. But I want every person in his [*sic*] own country, with this own people, close to his roots, to thrive there. To have the same opportunities and access to education, health care, a road network, clean water, BUT IN HIS OWN COUNTRY. To my country, he may come as an investor, or as a tourist, as I may also go to this. Or we may move to each other’s country by observing the necessary processes, not by violating them. [...]”

“Is that so, Madame Viper?” asked Giannis, another regular group member joining the discussion. “‘A country is not a human being?’ I am glad you have figured this out. Because up until now, you were stuck in this amazing obsession of calling Greece your ‘mother,’ and thus revealing the sexual misery that prevents you from understanding human reproduction as a result of the synthesis of humans (white, black and yellow), and instead reducing it to the soil and the earth. This view of love as stasis (the Earth, the soil, traditions and the sacred) and this fear of movement (synthesis, birth,

³⁶ *Ellinaras* (singular) or *Ellinares/Ellinarades* (plural) is a pejorative term used by Greeks (or Greek speakers) against other Greeks to describe them as people of low culture, low education and a blind adherence to the hegemonic ethno-religious narrative; further, as people who overcompensate for their parochialism and lack of cultivation with a boastful, but also highly virulent nationalism.

new life) are the typical symptoms of a bad love life. [...] But as much as you may try to convince yourself, EVERYTHING in this world – even the things you think you are defending – are the result of a constant bastardization of everything. Many races, many languages, many religions, many traditions have composed what today is ‘Greece,’ which you view as eternal and unchanging.”

This Facebook dialogue is an example of the rich original data I encountered in my research; it is indicative of the prime material from which the different “voices” emerged. As I indicated in the end of the previous chapter, I begin all three data chapters of my dissertation with a discussion mined from the wall of the *pro-jus soli* Facebook group, chosen each time to showcase the range of the conceptual categories examined in each chapter. The dialogue that launches this chapter starts with what might seem like a banal discussion on the conditions of entry and residence in modern nation-states. The discussion becomes more theoretical, however, when Polyxeni contests the concept of legality altogether, thus prompting the Viper to talk about her views on the principle of people moving away from their own nation-states and settling elsewhere. In the comment that concludes the dialogue, Giannis takes the discussion to a higher level of abstraction, beyond the socio-historical context of nation-states. Instead, he argues that mobility and mixture are normal patterns of human behavior, and that they are good for societies, not problematic.

Chapter Structure

In just this very short segment of online discussion, therefore, one can see the range of different ways in which people brought up and negotiated the concepts of “cross-border mobility,” and “inter-ethnic mixture.” The analysis of these concepts, as

well as the concept I have termed “Europeanness,” and whose relevance I explicate farther into this subsection, constitutes the work examined in the present chapter. I end Section I with a subsection that lays out the theoretical foundation that informs my analysis in this chapter. Subsequently, I embark on Section II, where I discuss the conceptual category I have termed “cross-border mobility” in terms of the conceptual differentiation it exhibited along each of its properties. I begin the section by examining how people represent the specifics of the issue at hand, i.e., the *volume* of migration flows into Greece and the *control* the Greek state has over these flows. Are people crossing national borders, particularly from the so-called Third World into Europe and Greece, too many? Has Greece been in control of who enters her territory, especially during the last two decades of mass immigration? Further, how open or restricted should such entry be? The question of entry is closely connected to the question of membership. People that enter, with or without documentation, may be able to regularize their status at a later point, and thus to also eventually claim national membership for themselves or their children. Conversations on entry lead to the issue of *legality*: are immigrants who enter “legally” more entitled to nationality than those who do not? Further and crucially, should states have the authority to characterize human mobility as “legal” or “illegal?” This leads into a discussion on what causes people to move – i.e., on the *normality* of mobility across national borders. Is moving away from one’s native land a human universal, so to speak? Or does it occur as a result of exceptional, and often adverse, circumstances?

Conversations on cross-border mobility bleed into conversations on ethnic contact, plurality and mixture, because the latter inevitably follows the former. When

people move away from their native lands, they come into contact with people who display different ethnic traits. They live next to them. They may interact with them in various ways – as neighbors and coworkers, or lovers and spouses. They may adopt their cultural patterns, or infuse their cultural patterns with some of their own. Or, depending on a series of factors, they may just stick to themselves – even in the latter case, however, natives and newcomers will still have to coexist within the same political body. Are such mixture and plurality *normal* – further, do they produce positive effects for human societies? Are they something that humans regularly do, something that produces more vigorous, dynamic social bodies? Or do they lead to loss of culture and identity? Again, much like in the case of mobility, people’s underlying ideological positions largely inform this discussion, in Section III of this chapter.

When negotiating the normality and effects of mixture, people whose voices I “heard” also spoke of *the kind of mixture* they begrudge, or, conversely, are willing to accept. In other words, they specified the ethnic or cultural traits that cause the greatest alarm to some participants in these debates. To anticipate, traits deemed the least compatible with the Greek dominant cultural idiom are traits that are perceived as not *European* – in a racial, cultural, or religious sense. Section IV includes a discussion on the nebulous, yet highly hegemonic and persistent concept of “*Europeanness*” (Hesse 2007: 646, emphasis in the original), the boundaries it historically has and continues to mark, as well as how the concept and its classificatory work manifest themselves in Greek discourses and social practices. This boundary informs conversations on mobility and mixture alike – in other words, it emerges as salient both as a physical border that is being crossed in the context of contemporary migrations, but also as an ethno-racial

demarcation. Data placed under this conceptual label are examined in terms of how *valid* this boundary is, i.e., whether people subscribe to the notion that it actually divides humanity in at least two distinct categories, and how *salient* it should be in determining who may become a member of the Greek national community.

Theoretical Foundation

Discussions that on the surface might be construed as mundane arguments on the number of people who enter Greece's territory, on immigrant entry requirements and on border controls emanate, in fact, from underlying, deeply ideological and highly normalized ways of thinking about people's relationship to territory and mobility (Malkki 1992; see also Cresswell 2006). In her seminal work that aims to expose and problematize this "nationalist common sense" (Malkki 1992: 3), anthropologist Liisa Malkki argues that nationalism represents the world as divided into distinct, spatially discontinuous, sovereign territorial units – nation-states. In this representation, the nation becomes synonymous to *homeland* and *soil*, thus naturalizing the relationship between people and the territory demarcated as national. Nationalist parlance, then, describes people as having *roots* in the national soil, much like plants that are naturally suited to their physical environments. Consequently, movement away from one's national land is represented as *uprootedness*, continuing the human tree metaphor. Further, because this relationship is represented as natural, it also confers a moral premium; people that lose their physical connection to their homeland also lose their moral bearings. Seen through the lens of belonging *rooted* in the national territory, human mobility appears pathological, dangerous and morally suspect.

Malkki's critique of this rooted conception of belonging, including the tree metaphor, draws heavily on post-structural theorists Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1987), who describe the broader model of thought and social practice hegemonic in Western modernity, in which nationalism is embedded. This highly essentialist model, Deleuze and Guattari argue, resembles a rooted, hierarchical structure – a tree – whose limbs and branches may only connect to its center – and this in an orderly, pre-determined fashion – rather than form multiple, unsystematic connections to each other exploring a wealth of possibilities.

Deleuze and Guattari's description of a rooted structure with a fixed, essential center – a “pre-discursive core” (1987: 6) – also echoes strongly with the way nationalist norms represent “culture” as a bounded set of cognitive and behavioral patterns that persists inter-generationally and is distinct enough to differentiate each ethno-national group from all the others. Given the fact that nationalism, as Chapter Two explicates, prescribes a world divided into distinct, bounded, homogeneous ethno-national units, this representation of culture is highly normative. Moreover, it further justifies the partition of the world into such units. On the topic of mixture examined here, if culture is perceived in this way, then the prospect of cultural mixture generates a fear of adulteration – i.e., of the kind change that spoils and corrupts something that has hitherto been authentic and pure, and which should remain so.

Notably, discussions in my data on the normality and effects of ethnic mixture were not only about culture, but about biology as well. Discussions engaging biology were marginal – as I explicate in Section IV of the present chapter, following a series of socio-historical developments, biology has been suppressed in public discourse, and

culture (thing-like and naturalized) has risen to mark more or less the same boundaries. Yet a biological discourse still rears its head, particularly in discursive contexts where political correctness is not as imperative (e.g., semi-anonymous online submissions or online fora dominated by the extreme Right), betraying a persisting conception of nations – in general and the Greek ethno-national group in particular – as distinct biological units, and of mixture as something that violates this natural order.

The converse to this nationalist worldview takes mobility as dynamic and healthy, as something that promotes collective progress and freedom. Similarly, culture is not fixed, but consists in fluid, diverse, multiple processes of learning each other's ways, which cross, straddle and ultimately dispute the relevance of administrative borders (*inter alia* Clifford 1997, 2004; Cresswell 2006; Gilroy 1993; Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Mahler 2012; Malkki 1992). This critique of territorialized identity, and essentialized, bounded culture finds its way to the spotlight of the public discursive arena – when it indeed does – mostly via the social sciences, and particularly post-structuralist anthropology and the kind of ethnographic research that documents ground-level practices that contradict and belie nationalist norms (e.g., Karakasidou 1997; for a detailed review of this ethnographic work that pertains to the Greek context, please see Chapter Two).

In the body of data examined for my dissertation, such conceptions of fluid, de-centered, plural group and individuals subjectivities were indeed put forward. Among the prominent advocates for this position were many Greek social scientists, who spoke out in favor of the *jus soli* legislative initiative. But public intellectuals were not the only people to articulate this voice. Facebook discussants, journalists and, to a lesser degree,

politicians also expressed such views, often drawing on academic scholarship to support their arguments.

II. CROSS-BORDER MOBILITY

In Chapter One, I explained that the *jus soli* legislative initiative did not come out of the blue. In reality, pro-membership activists had been preparing for it in various ways in anticipation of the Socialists' political victory. To reiterate, a scant month after this victory, the Socialist Prime Minister George Papandreou announced his government's intention officially at the annual Global Forum on Migration and Development, which in 2009 took place in Athens. At his speech there, on November 5, 2009, Papandreou stated that his government intended to propose "nationality upon the birth of a young person in our territory" (Papandreou 2009).

Immediate reactions to this statement varied, and will be discussed in the relevant sections throughout my dissertation. Among these reactions was a formal request for explanations by the center-Right opposition party, and specifically by MP Evangelos Antonaros, on how "automatic" such membership would be – in other words, was Papandreou talking of unconditional birthright nationality? Such a prospect, Antonaros' "current question"³⁷ stated, "will intensify the constantly rising migration current toward Greece and will render our country an even more attractive destination for illegal immigrants." Or would membership be limited to children of documented immigrants, somewhat lowering this risk? Also, the question continued, "how will our country convince our European partners that it will do everything necessary to halt the waves of

³⁷ A "current question" refers to a question addressed by a Member of the Parliament to the Prime Minister or any of the government's ministers in relation to an issue of current significance. The party addressed must then offer an oral response. Retrieved from <http://www.hellenicparliament.gr/en/Koinovouleftikos-Elenchos/Mesa-Koinovouleutikou-Elegxou>

illegal immigrants, when it offers nationality so open-handedly, unlike other countries in the European Union?”

Antonaros’ question was posed formally on November 16, 2009 and answered on the same day by Socialist Vice Minister of the Interior Theodora Tzakri, who clarified that, under the proposed law, nationality would be granted only to children of documented immigrants; further, a minimum number of residence years would be required for both parents and for those children applying for nationality independently, as orphans or unescorted minors. Tzakri’s explanation notwithstanding, this exchange was only the beginning of a discussion that became central within the broader debate on the national membership. Drawing on Papandreou’s vague allusion to birthright nationality, the bill’s opponents framed the issue as one of *lax national borders – both in terms of physical entry into Greek territory, but also in terms of entry into the Greek political community*.

“Other European countries do not face the waves of illegal and uncontrollable migration that Greece faces,” center-Right opposition leader Antonis Samaras said in a statement published verbatim in *Eleftherotypia* on January 11, 2010 – i.e., when the debate on the proposed law was well under way. “Nevertheless, they adopt strict preconditions for naturalization and the granting of nationality. We, who face an acute problem of uncontrollable entry of migrants, instead of being careful, we descend, with this law, to the lowest threshold. We go against logic, against our interests, but also against the rest of our partners. This is a bill that facilitates the illegal entry of immigrants, so that they have children in Greece, and then the children are granted

nationality automatically, and the parents are thus legalized as well³⁸ (*Eleftherotypia* 2010a).

This argument, articulated by Samaras' center-Right party, but also very strongly by the far Right, may be thus summarized in the following way: If national membership becomes so easily available to immigrants' children born or socialized in Greece, the country stands to become a "magnet" for people, particularly from the so-called Third World, fleeing adversity in their own countries. Further, migration currents from such countries toward Europe are already excessive; in the particular case of Greece, they are also out of control, due both to the country's porous borders and its geographical position as Europe's gateway. Within this context, the prospect of nationality, for dependent children, and, therefore possibly for their parents as well, will act as an additional incentive – will even give undocumented migrants a motive "for pregnancy as a means to naturalization," as Samaras said during his February 8 parliamentary address. As a result, Greece will become full, more than it already is, of people that may also claim nationality after a certain number of years – a prospect particularly undesirable given the country's economic outlook. "In circumstances of unprecedented recession, [the government] takes measures that essentially turn Greece into a magnet for new waves of illegal migration," Samaras told his colleagues on February 8.

This argument of excessive, uncontrollable migration currents, was put forward particularly by the political Right, three out of the four newspapers I included in my sample, i.e., *Proto Thema*, *I Kathimerini*, and *To Vima*, as well as by highly partisan

³⁸ In his February 8 parliamentary address, Samaras argued that this was an additional reason why his party countered the *jus soli* initiative with a proposal that Greek-born children be granted nationality at majority instead – so that the parents of these children would not have a claim to legal residence or even nationality as parents of Greek minors.

online discussants. On Opengov – and particularly in the early batch of submissions, strongly suspected to have originated from operatives of the political campaign against the proposed law – this argument emerged as a dominant discursive theme.

“Asia has 4.5 million hungry, wretched people. [...] Can our little Greece save them?” read an Opengov submission.

With the exception of *Eleftherotypia*, whose pages hosted no arguments against the proposed law, newspapers I examined articulated the argument of excessive and out of control mobility in diverse forms and degrees. In a January 24 feature by staff writer Panagiotis Savvidis, *Proto Thema* denounced the “mass naturalization of foreigners the government promotes” (Savvidis 2010a); similarly, in his January 17 column, the newspaper’s publisher Themis Anastasiadis declared that he did not “disagree at all that little illegal immigrants of the second and third generation must have every human right, AS LONG AS you ensure that more will not come in every day” (Anastasiadis 2010). In *To Vima*, staff columnist Laurie Keza spoke, in a December 23 column, of “the sieve that stands between us and Asia and Africa” (Keza 2009a), while on November 7 the same writer had raised an alert against what she called an already observed trend of birth tourism, bound to be strengthened by the proposed law. “Every time a pregnant woman’s water breaks in Albania or Skopje, she will get in the car to come give birth in Greece – as if in a federal state. An increased turnout of women from African countries to birth clinics has also been observed,” Keza wrote (Keza 2009b). In *Kathimerini*, staff columnist Stavros Lygeros pondered the issue in several articles, noting that “easy” nationality would feed the flows of undocumented entries – Lygeros however is quoted

more extensively below, as he focused more on the issue of legality as a criterion for national membership.

Table 4-1 Representing “Cross-Border Mobility” as “Excessive” and “Out of Control”

Politicians	PASOK	Not present
	ND	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader in his two formal statements published in <i>Eleftherotypia</i> , and during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in almost 80 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in almost 55 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in three commentaries (two by the same staff columnist) and in one feature.
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in five commentaries (three by the same staff columnist).
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Present in two commentaries and two features.
Public Intellectuals	Not present	
Opengov	Present in 65 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.	
Facebook	Present in 27 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.	

A discourse that represents migration into Greece as “flooding” may, of course, be seen as a rhetorical device intended to foster an impression of danger and urgency. Apart from this, however, it also points to an underlying conception of human mobility as aberrant and dangerous. This becomes more evident, if one follows this argument to its next turn, where the “legality” of immigrants’ entry is also brought forward as a factor that should weigh in their chances for nationality.

The scenario that the prospect of nationality for the second generation will cause further “flooding,” becomes more plausible – this argument continues – given Greece’s precedent of mass regularization exercises in the past two decades. Since mass immigration to Greece started after the collapse of the Socialist Bloc, the only people eligible to migrate through official channels were either ethnic Greeks or seasonal migrants. Consequently, most other migrants entered and stayed without documentation. A large number among them, however, were able to regularize their status in one of these three programs implemented between 1996 and 2004 precisely to deal with the reality of a vast population living and working in the margins of the law, and the multitude of problems that such a reality caused for immigrants and the receiving society alike. This precedent, the bill’s opponents argued, sends the message that more people can come in this way and nevertheless eventually become documented and thus eligible for nationality for themselves or their children, i.e., the second generation.

“[...] these people will be legalized in Greece sooner or later, just as it happened in the case of hundreds of thousands others, who entered Greece illegally, while society has reached its limits and cannot absorb any more immigrants,” Samaras said on February 8.

“Every regularization fed the next wave, reinforcing the impression that whoever enters Greece illegally is not turned away and is at some point legalized,” wrote Lygeros in *Kathimerini* on January 3. While granting nationality to documented immigrants’ children born and socialized in Greece “is obviously an imperative,” Lygeros wrote, the same is not the case for members of the second generation whose parents entered the country without proper documentation. “The message that Greece grants nationality

relatively easy will arrive at the illegal immigrants' countries of origin and feed the current of illegal migration" (Lygeros 2010).

Apart from the pragmatic concerns related to mass entry, regularization and, eventually and potentially, naturalization, conversations on immigrants' "legality" reveal an underlying, normative conception of cross-border mobility as something that should be strictly regulated by states – if not considered a criminal act. In the political debate, the issue of legality was largely raised by the Right – both by the conservative New Democracy party, but also, and more intensely, by the far Right LAOS party. "In Greece," center-Right opposition leader Antonis Samaras wrote in a formal memo to the government published verbatim in *Eleftherotypia* on January 11, "[...] we have immigrants with legal and permanent residence, who, however, in their large majority entered illegally. Let it be noted that, in other European countries, illegal entry hardly ever leads to legalization, let alone naturalization." If the *jus soli* bill passes, Samaras continued, "a precedent is created with dangerous consequences and implications" (Samaras 2010).

To guard against this scenario, Samaras and his party proposed that nationality be limited to *adult* members of the second generation, whose parents are documented immigrants, and who were born and socialized exclusively in Greece. For the Far Right, however, there is no such thing as documented immigrants in Greece. The governing party may very well claim the law only applies to documented immigrants, LAOS leader Giorgos Karatzaferis said at the National Assembly during the February 8 formal debate, but this is far from accurate. "You're talking about five-hundred and thirty thousand legal [immigrants]. They're not legal; they're legalized. Legal is he who enters by the rules,

respecting the state's rules. How many of these [immigrants] respected the state at their first contact with the state?"

In this representation, the way in which people transverse national borders, that is by obeying or breaking state rules, becomes a measure of moral character – in turn, moral character becomes a criterion for national membership. To recall the theoretical discussion in the introductory section of the present chapter, nationalist norms represent people who have moved away from their “roots” as people who have lost their moral bearings (and thus not just their geographic ones), and are consequently dangerous (Malkki 1992).

Among newspapers, *Proto Thema* was the only one to articulate this discursive theme, in a January 24 commentary piece, whose author was not indicated.

“Making Greek anyone who jumped the wire fence or came in a boat is “a sure recipe for trouble,” the article argued. “By entering Greece illegally, one *de facto* shows indifference to the laws of the country where he asks to be legalized as a national. The logic ‘I have come in and I will dig my heels in until you have no option but to make me a member of your family is a cocky, bullying attitude, which can be easily transferred to the rest of a migrant’s life” (*Proto Thema* 2010).

Table 4-2 Representing “Cross-Border Mobility” as “Illegal”

Politicians	PASOK	Not present
	ND	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader in his two formal statements published in <i>Eleftherotypia</i> , and during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in almost 20 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 33 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in two commentaries (by the same staff columnist).
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Present in one commentary and one feature.
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Opengov		Present in 31 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 14 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

Taking this notion of undocumented entry as a measure of moral character further, the far Right, including highly partisan online discussants, represented mobility as *invasion* – i.e., as an act of aggression against the national state and its people.

Jus soli, said LAOS MP Alexandros Chrysanthakopoulos in his March 9 parliamentary address, “is the *jus* of imperialism, of colonialists, of conquerors, of invaders, of trespassers, of settlers, of colonials, and of all invaders.” In other words, at the furthest-nationalist end of this study’s conceptual spectrum, then, cross-border mobility that stands to upset the neat scheme of national states as discontinuous containers of ethno-homogeneous populations is represented as a violent, abusive act.

Table 4-3 Representing “Cross-Border Mobility” as “Abnormal” and “Detrimental”

Politicians	PASOK	Not present
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Present in one parliamentary address (out of 33) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Opengov		Present in ten out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in six out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

Evidently, this notion of mobility was articulated by the set of voices that correspond to the discursive camp I conceptualize as nationalist – in other words, the set of voices that confirmed a normal and proper division of the world into distinct, ethno-homogeneous, sovereign territorial units. In the paragraphs that follow, I switch the analysis to how mobility was represented by the second camp, i.e., the people who sought to upset this nationalist worldview albeit without contesting its core premises. To anticipate, within discussions on cross-border mobility, this camp consists primarily, albeit not exclusively, of the governing Socialists, i.e., the political party charged, at that moment, with representing the Greek state – a state traditionally committed to the nationalist doctrine – but also with the effort to upset this doctrine and establish new norms for political membership. Discussions on mobility, and especially the degree to which it falls within state’s authority to regulate or restrict, make their ambiguous positionality particularly evident.

As may be expected, the governing Socialists joined this discussion on numbers, controls and legality – forced on them, one may argue, by the Right – to defend their legislative initiative. Crucially, however, they did not attack the Right’s argument at its premise. Rather, they *reproduced* the argument’s core view of excessive, uncontrollable mobility from the Third World into Greece and Europe – mobility that the state is required and entitled to curb. Of course Greece and Europe cannot absorb “such large human currents,” Prime Minister George Papandreou told the legislature during his February 8 address. Greece’s geographic position, Papandreou conceded, renders it particularly vulnerable to the migration of people from Asia, Africa and the Middle East into Europe. “About 70 percent of illegal migration at the outer borders of Europe occurred in Greece,” he said.

This argument of excessive migration flows and porous borders featured in the vast majority of the parliamentary addresses made by members of Papandreou’s governing party during the three-day debate surrounding the voting process. Below, I cite one such occurrence. The words of Socialist MP Athanasios Papageorgiou do not highlight any additional aspects of his party’s main position. Crucially, however, they shed abundant light on the fact that an argument premised on borders and controls ultimately generates discourses and practices of exclusion – even if the argument in question is put forward as part of an effort to legitimate the expansion of collective boundaries.

“Studies estimate that, by 2020, European countries will face the hordes of nationals of the Third World or of undeveloped countries, who will be attempting to reach the “heaven” of Europe,” Papageorgiou said during his March 10 parliamentary

address. Asia, he continued, “is now the demographic center of the world. The population of one of these countries for example, Bangladesh, equals the population of the entire European Union. These peoples have no other avenue for their life, and they will try everything to find these heavens.” In this sense, Papageorgiou continued, “the problem is the guarding of borders, repatriations, and all these elements that must protect our country from overpopulation, from all the potential dangers.”

Much like Greece’s political Right, then, Papageorgiou’s statement paints an unquestionably Eurocentric image of cross-border flows – further, his talk of “hordes” strongly evokes the highly exclusionary notion of immigrants as “invaders” articulated, as I demonstrated earlier, by a deputy of the far-Right LAOS party. Moreover, it reiterates the Socialists’ objective, stated unequivocally by Papandreou and his competent ministers, to seal the country’s borders against future entries – even as they were expanding the nation’s boundaries for those immigrants already in the country. Indeed, along with their *jus soli* provision for members of the second generation who were already in Greece and who met a certain number of conditions, the Socialists stressed that they had a specific plan in the works for the protection of Greece’s borders.

“Yes, we will reinforce [...] the protection of our borders,” Papandreou told the Assembly on February 8. “It is part of our policy. They were open; they were a ‘fenceless vineyard’.”

In PASOK’s mission to shield the country’s borders from undocumented migration, the flagship was the recent establishment at Greece’s biggest port, Piraeus, of

a branch of Frontex³⁹ – something that Papandreou hailed as a “great diplomatic success” and the competent minister, Michalis Chrysochoidis⁴⁰, said that it “signifie[d] the end of the ‘fenceless vineyard.’”

Table 4-4 Representing of “Cross-Border Mobility” as “Excessive,” but “Under Control”

Politicians	PASOK	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in almost 75 percent of its MPs’ addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in one commentary and one feature.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in three commentaries (two by the same staff columnist).
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in one feature.
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Present in two articles written by two law professors.
Opengov		Present in two out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 15 out of 470 discussion threads in the pro- <i>jus soli</i> group.

This emphasis on borders and controls places this view articulated by the governing Socialists within the second camp of voices, i.e., the one that seeks to upset the nationalist scheme of social organization by including non-ethnic Greeks in the national community, yet without contesting its main premises. In the following paragraphs, I discuss how this camp conceptualized “legality.”

³⁹ The acronym Frontex denotes the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union (<http://frontex.europa.eu/>).

⁴⁰ At the time, Chrysochoidis was the Socialist Minister for Public Order.

Following the discursive agenda set out by the Right, the Socialists turned from the issue of numbers and controls to a discussion of legality. This is where the middle ground they were trying to tread became boggy. The Socialists' argument is encapsulated in Papandreou's words at the February 8 debate: "Obviously, we are not talking about the mass legalization of immigrants. There is no such clause in the bill we have submitted. We are not talking about this. We are not talking about the naturalization of people who do not have legal papers," Papandreou said. "No immigrant without legal papers can acquire nationality. Also, for a child to acquire Greek nationality, its parents must be legal residents. You know what message we send? That there is no point in anyone coming to Greece illegally today, hoping for legal residence through bearing a child that will be a national." This does not mean, Papandreou continued, that his government intends to deny protection to those undocumented migrants who need it, particularly refugees. It does, however, give "a clear sign: we offer Greek nationality only to those who through their actions respect our laws, choosing – provided they are not forced to break the law – the road of legality."

Further, the Socialists addressed the Right's argument that currently documented migrants also, in their vast majority, entered Greece through irregular channels. To counter the Right's position, they put forward two arguments. First, that undocumented entry is the norm and acceptable given the fact that people are forced to move. More specifically, Chrysochoidis denounced the Right's "unheard of distinctions" between "legal and legalized" immigrants. In no country of the world today, Chrysochoidis said on February 8, do migrants enter via the type of "legal" process that Mr. Karatzaferis described, which includes full documentation and things like medical exams. To

reinforce his point, Chrysochoidis referred to the “wall of shame” the United States are building “trying to prevent the miserable and wretched Latin Americans from entering their soil.” Second, the Socialists argued that people who entered Greece informally acquired formal documentation in the course of their stay there. It is true, Papandreou said on February 8, that most of Greece’s currently documented immigrants are “legalized” rather than legal, “but it is a permit that the Greek state formally decided to give them. And this allowed them to live today normally among us and next to us.”

Table 4-5 Representing “Cross-Border Mobility” as “Conditionally Legal”

Politicians	PASOK	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in almost 75 percent ⁴¹ of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in one commentary.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in one commentary.
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in two commentaries (by the same staff columnist).
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Present in the article of one law professor.
Opengov		Present in four out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted in favor of the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in seven out of 470 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

Yet, in the process of affirming legality as something that determines access to national membership, but also describing people forced to violate states’ entry rules as “miserable and wretched,” Papandreou and his party also reproduced the part of the

⁴¹ This figure includes instances when PASOK MPs simply emphasized that only “legal” immigrants would be eligible for nationality under the proposed law, without delving into the issue of legality any deeper.

Right's argument that conceptualized legality as a yardstick of moral character – membership, Papandreou said, is limited to “those who through their actions respect our laws.” Yet to exempt from this category of law-breakers those migrants already in Greece and eligible for membership under the proposed law, the Socialists also made the issue one of *agency*. In other words, immigrants eligible for membership under the proposed law were only those who did not violate Greece's entry requirements through an act of choice (which would be illegal – a crime), but rather were people fleeing adverse circumstances, and who therefore truly had no choice to make. The bill does not grant nationality to “foreign agents, terrorists, or crooks”, to those “working on behalf of drug, arms or human trafficking networks”, or to “hard-core Islamists,” said Socialist MP Ioannis Diamantidis, who delivered his party's opening address on March 10, at the outset of the three-day debate surrounding the voting process. Rather, Diamantidis said, the bill is addressed to “the family of lawfully working immigrants, children who receive a Greek education, those who loved our land and developed ties to it, those born here.”

In this second conceptual camp, which seeks to upset the nationalist scheme, yet does not break from its core premises, mobility is not portrayed as pathological or aberrant. Rather, it is re-defined as an acceptable act within certain exceptional circumstances. Or – much like many other second-camp viewpoints, as I demonstrate throughout my data chapters – it is redefined using elements of the Greek hegemonic narrative. To demonstrate the latter tendency, I resort again to the statement by the PASOK MP quoted earlier, Athanasios Papageorgiou, whose mention of “hordes” evoked, I argued, the notion of “invaders” propagated by the far Right. Yet Papageorgiou

proceeded, practically in the same breath, to redefine mobility as a creative, dynamic process – and in this way as something inherently Greek.

“Greeks were always cosmopolitan,” Papageorgiou told his colleagues. “I have read several comparative studies, which compared Bulgarians – Bulgaria, which was a closed, rural society – to Greeks, who were people of travel, people of flight. This resulted in half of Greece residing outside our borders,” he said, referring to the multitude of Greek emigrant communities. “Do we not know that until a few years ago Astoria was Greece’s fourth largest city?” These histories, Papageorgiou continued, “should make us Greeks wiser, more open, in keeping with the tradition of open horizons, and the tradition of a people who has its eyes open and its mind open and is a people of flight, a people of globalization; it is not a closed people.”

In Papageorgiou’s representation, mobility acquires positive connotations, because it is tied to one of the key components in the Greek hegemonic narrative – Greek diaspora and cosmopolitanism, as well as to a representation of Greece as “civilized” and “progressive,” unlike its backward Balkan neighbors. In other words, mobility is redefined in a way that largely reproduces specific ethno-racial hierarchies – much like mixture is also redefined, as I demonstrate in Section III.

A similar representation of cross-border mobility as not quite normal – in other words, not a universal, habitual and therefore unproblematic pattern – but not quite pathological either came from the Communist Left, and was very close conceptually to the Socialists’ representation of mobility as trauma. Namely, Communist MPs also represented mobility as primarily the result of adverse circumstances forcing people to

flee their native lands. In other words, people shouldn't have to move (become uprooted), but do so to flee adversity which is most often not of their own doing.

“We, as a party, let us make this clear, would very much wish that no poor laborer, no poor farmer leaves his homeland,” said KKE leader Aleka Pappariga during her February 8 parliamentary address. Rather, she said, she and her party would wish for immigrants “to stay and fight, not stay and go hungry, and to reinforce the army of the [class] struggle. But you cannot forbid them to leave, since they are hungry. Of course, we would like Albanians to stay in Albania, not because Greece has no space for all of us, but because they must fight there. But this is what people are like. Their children are hungry, so they come with the traffickers.”

Table 4-6 Representing “Cross-Border Mobility” as “Trauma”

Politicians	PASOK	Articulated by the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in almost 25 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader during her Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 85 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in one commentary.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in three commentaries (two by the same staff columnist).
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Present in the article of one law professor and one labor researcher.
Opengov		Present in four out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted in favor of the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in seven out of 470 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

So far, Pappariga's argument is almost identical to that of the Socialists. Yet the KKE leader and her deputies charged the governing party with shirking, in its argumentation, the causes of the adversity that forces people to move, and particularly the complicity of states – including Greece – in creating the circumstances that force immigrants to abandon their home countries. And this is where, in my interpretation, the second conceptual camp on mobility and the third briefly meet, before diverging again. As we saw, the Socialists sought to de-criminalize mobility and instead represent it as the result of trauma and limited agency – but also criminal and irregular and massive enough and directed from Third World into Europe to justify a series of controls, including Frontex, and to justify legality as a yardstick of moral character and condition for national membership. On the antipode, the Left, including the Communists and the Coalition of the Radical Left (SYRIZA), attacked the discourse of mass, Europe-bounded, out-of-control mobility at its premise.

“You lie, all of you, I will say it clearly, that Greece and Europe receive the entire wave of migration,” Pappariga continued addressing her colleagues on February 8. “Most migration goes to third countries, the so-called Third World, it goes to Asia.”

Table 4-7 Representing “Cross-Border Mobility” as “Not Excessive” or “Out of Control”

Politicians	PASOK	Not present
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader during her Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in over 85 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Articulated by the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 20 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in one commentary.
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals	Not present	
Opengov	Present in three out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted in favor of the <i>jus soli</i> bill.	
Facebook	Present in five out of 470 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.	

“But in any case,” Pappariga continued, “if we start with the issue of how many can fit into Greece: we pose the question: How many can fit in the world? Why do they not fit in their own countries? Is imperialist war, imperialist intervention, not the cause?” Pappariga asked her colleagues. “If things go the way they have been going in Afghanistan, all the people persecuted by al Qaeda will stay there to be slaughtered? Will they not migrate? And what will we tell them? That you are illegal and you can’t fit?”

Table 4-8 Representing “Legality” as “Arbitrary”

Politicians	PASOK	Present in two parliamentary addresses (out of 58) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader during her Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in over 70 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Articulated by the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 80 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in two commentaries and one feature.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Present in the article of one economics professor, one labor researcher, and one written jointly by a law professor and a political scientist.
Opengov		Present in five out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted in favor of the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 14 out of 470 discussion threads in the <i>pro-jus soli</i> group.

In this sense, rather than illegal, mobility becomes a *right* and the states’ authority to regulate it loses its legitimacy given the compliance of states in creating the conditions that force people to move. Labor researcher Apostolos Kapsalis, in his opinion piece published in *Avgi* on February 7 spoke of “the universal right to migration” (Kapsalis 2010), whereas SYRIZA MP Iro Dioti made the following statement during her March 10 parliamentary address.

“I am of the opinion that the mobility of people is ultimately unavoidable, but it also a right. It is not an illegal act, even if it is represented as such by those who do not tolerate difference [...]. It is they who insist on calling people ‘illegal immigrants.’ [...] I call on you to think of this issue from a perspective of rights, not repression.”

Further, voices in this third discursive camp also contested the bipolar representations of migrants as either criminals or victims.

“We know very well that the history of humanity is the history of mobile populations throughout the ages,” said SYRIZA MP Theodoros Dritsas, during his March 9 parliamentary address. Besides, Dritsas continued, “migration currents” consist of people “who have a series of capabilities, educational and cultural. This is why they seek a better fate elsewhere. For better or worse, migration currents as a rule are not made up by the most wretched of these countries. They become wretched in the process of trying to emigrate, to find a better fate, or to survive. They can be very creative forces in whichever country they go.”

Table 4-9 Representing “Cross-Border Mobility” as “Normal” and “Productive”

Politicians	PASOK	Articulated by the party’s leader during his November 4 speech.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Articulated by the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 30 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Opengov		Present in three out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted in favor of the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 15 out of 470 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

In this section, I discussed the conceptual range of “cross-border mobility.” This category exhibited variation along the following discursive areas (properties):

(1) volume and control, i.e., the numbers of people who migrate into Greece, the degree to which such migration should be restricted, as well as whether the state's physical borders are, or should be guarded well enough to make such restriction possible; (2) the notion of "legality," i.e., whether migration may be deemed "legal" or "illegal," and how this may translate into a criterion for national membership; and (3) a more abstract, conceptual discussion on the normality or aberrance of the phenomenon of people moving away from their native lands. In the next section, I move on to the conceptual area of ethnic mixture.

III. ETHNIC MIXTURE

In the previous section, I discussed the way voices "heard" in the course of this study talked about the phenomenon of people crossing international borders. My analysis followed a path from the specifics of the issue at hand, i.e., migration patterns into Greece at the present socio-historical instance, to people's broad, underlying, ideological conceptions of cross-border mobility. In this section, which focuses on conversations on mixture, I follow the reverse path. That is, I begin by examining the range of views on the ontology of ethno-national mixture, and then move to discussions that gradually zoom in on the present socio-historical conjuncture. Representations of mixture range from a universal and fruitful human pattern to something aberrant and destructive. As the discussion shifts to specifics, what emerges as salient is the *kind of mixture* people consider.

In the Facebook dialogue that launched this chapter, the last comment represented mixture as "synthesis" – as something positive and fruitful that produces "new life." What is more, its author represented mixture as a universal norm, in the world in general,

and in the Greek nation-state in particular. Rather than a result of contemporary, increased cross-border mobility, mixture is what has been normal all along, the online submission argued – it is a human universal that drives the world and predates the national state, which emerged at a specific point in human history. “Everything in this world,” the comment stated, “is the result of a constant bastardization of everything. Many races, many languages, many religions, many traditions have composed what today is ‘Greece.’”

The description above of “constant bastardization” describes what in the social sciences is commonly termed “hybridity,” i.e., the kind of mixture that straddles categories, and discounts ethnic, essentialized boundaries (e.g., Pieterse 2001). A detailed review of the concept’s genealogy and constitution in multiple intellectual arenas and traditions falls beyond the scope of this work. Here, following Jan Nederveen Pieterse (2001), I wish to emphasize that hybridity is about boundaries – i.e., a concept that denotes the connections, patterns and exchanges that take place at the boundaries of established categories, and thus contest these categories’ salience.

A view of hybridity as a human universal and as a constitutive element of our societies even in their present, nationalized form clashes, of course, with nationalist representations of ethno-national groups as homogeneous and bounded. Rather, and as argued in the theoretical discussions in Chapter Two and in the present chapter’s introductory section, such a view currently finds supreme expression in the social sciences, and particularly post-structuralist scholarship, which represents “culture” and “identity” as ever-evolving sets of processes, rather than fixed essences, and emphasizes de-centered, fluid and plural group and individual subjectivities (*inter alia* Clifford 1994,

1997; Gilroy 2004; Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Mahler 2012). In my data, such views were indeed expressed by those public intellectuals who, as members of civil society, threw their weight behind the proposed legislative initiative. An example is sociologist and prominent activist Miltos Pavlou, who, in an editorial hosted in *Eleftherotypia* on December 2, proposed the argument that the inclusion of immigrants into the national body “threatens national ‘homogeneity’ [...] ignores that Greece, as every modern nation-state, has been established, has been transformed, and has evolved through the convergences of different local and regional cultural identities, and that each one of us carries a wealth of completely different ethnic and social identifications” (Pavlou 2009a).

As Pavlou’s statement indicates, what this theoretical paradigm – and its corresponding third voice – mostly rejects is the idea of a “core,” i.e., a fixed essence that centers group and individual subjectivities, arranges all their characteristics into an orderly scheme, and contains potential differentiation. Conversely, and as Chapter Two argues, the notion of such a “core” is the foundational element of the nationalist ideology (critiques by *inter alia* Balibar 1991; Verdery 1994). This perspective also takes for granted that such national groups enjoy shared cultural ideas and practices which make them distinctive and which endure from generation to generation. Indeed, nationalists are readily identified by their expression of this idea of a cultural core, and by the fact that they cannot tolerate the “bastardization” of this core.

Consequently, I have classified views on mixture as more or less nationalist depending on the degree to which people adhere to this idea. Evidently, notions of “constant bastardization” or fluid, multiple identifications break with the idea of a core

completely, and thus fall within the third discursive camp, which contests nationalism at its basis.

Table 4-10 Representing “Ethno-Cultural Mixture” as “Normal” and “Productive”

Politicians	PASOK	Present in three parliamentary addresses (out of 58) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Present in 20 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in two commentaries and two features.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Present in the article of one sociologist.
Opengov		Present in three out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted in favor of the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 25 out of 470 discussion threads in the <i>jus soli</i> group.

People, on the other hand, who wished to be inclusive without breaking with nationalism altogether, maintained the idea of a core set of cultural patterns, which mixture nevertheless reinvigorates without altering their basic character.

“Our national identity, ladies and gentlemen colleagues, is strong, because it is based on universal values and on our civilization,” PASOK MP Kostas Geitonas told his colleagues on March 9. It is one thing to propose “safety valves” as a part of the new nationality regime in the process of being created, he said, and a different thing altogether to cultivate fear and deny “the bridging of difference. Everything marries, ladies and gentlemen colleagues, in life and history – languages and cultures included – and this is how the identity of nations and communities is reinforced and revitalized.”

The gist of this argument, then, is the following: Mixture should be celebrated and welcome, because it reinvigorates social bodies. Further and crucially, it should not be feared, because the “core” elements of our collective, Greek “identity” have persisted through the ages and are too strong to be modified. This tried and true persistence ensures that new cultural patterns will be incorporated in such a way that they enrich and bolster the ethno-cultural community, yet without altering its basic character.

Indeed, in my data this view of a strong “identity” that welcomes and incorporates new elements was expressed mostly by governing Socialists in their addresses, but also in online discussions in favor of the proposed law.

Table 4-11 Representing “Ethno-Cultural Mixture” as Conditionally “Normal” and “Productive”

Politicians	PASOK	Present in almost 15 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Opengov		Present in five out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted in favor of the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in seventeen out of 470 discussion threads in the pro- <i>jus soli</i> group.

On the nationalist end of the conceptual spectrum, the nationalist norm regarding mixture is best encapsulated, I think in the following comment I encountered again in my Opengov data.

“In my opinion, different peoples are something that makes our world beautiful; they are a heritage for our planet and our civilization. What good will it do us to ruin this beauty? There is no better thing than seeing Dutch people in Holland, Kenyans in Kenya and Greeks in Greece. Unfortunately, today, we think of multiculturalism as the incessant mixture of people of different races or cultures. I am afraid that this will lead to a culture-less mass of people. [...] When others look for their lost identity, we are proud of never having lost ours. If we begin integrating immigrants, this will serve as a motive for the advent of more, who will, as a matter of course, adulterate our cultural elements.”

This discursive segment reproduces a conception of the world as naturally segmented into national units, each with its own “culture.” Mixture is aberrant. First of all, it is something that is becoming a norm “today;” secondly, rather than synthesis, it produces *loss* of culture and identity. Second, it recognizes and values difference, but only in the sense of a set of different, bounded ethno-national bodies whose plurality “makes the world beautiful.” Difference within the same political unit is aberrant and destructive – a view encapsulated in a statement by the center-Right opposition leader made in the Parliament on February 8 and reproduced below.

The government preaches multiculturalism, Antonis Samaras charged, but does not realize that it is an “ideological construct” that’s being abandoned, even by those who tried it out. Multiculturalism, the opposition leader stressed, is not equivalent to tolerating difference. If this were what it is, his party would raise no objections. Rather, it is two other things, “more dangerous.” First, Samaras said, multiculturalism results in “reproducing those who are different, namely foreign immigrants, in the form of a ghetto.” Thus, he said, “it reproduces racism.”

Table 4-12 Representing “Ethno-Cultural Mixture” as “Abnormal” and “Aberrant”

Politicians	PASOK	Not present
	ND	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader in his two formal statements published in <i>Eleftherotypia</i> , and during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 13 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Present in 33 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in one commentary.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in two commentaries.
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals	Not present	
Opengov	Present in 48 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.	
Facebook	Present in 33 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.	

In Chapter Six, I discuss the social outcomes of pluralism to which Samaras alludes to here – in other words, the effects that the inclusion or exclusion of immigrants stands to have on the collective body’s social order and cohesion. In the present discussion, I wish to emphasize not the perceived effects of pluralism, but the *kind of difference* represented as problematic.

“Multiculturalism,” the conservatives’ leader continued, “claims that all cultures can supposedly co-exist harmoniously, but this has been belied. There are cultural features, which, excuse me but they cannot coexist. The *burka*, for example, cannot be accepted in a liberal western society. Polygamy cannot be accepted, nor other customs that lead, for example, to the violent, abusive treatment of women within our societies, because all these [customs] ultimately invalidate our own culture.”

What Samaras did was to draw a rigid boundary between a “liberal, western society” on one side and social and cultural practices often associated with Islam and the non-Western world on the other. His statement carves out a couple of analytical paths the researcher is compelled to follow. First, the way he understands cultural mixture, i.e., as impossible and unacceptable, if it crosses the boundary he drew, is indicative of the mode of immigrant incorporation that he is about to propose. To tease Chapter Five, which picks up Samaras’ statement at the point where it ends here, the conservatives’ leader and his party will premise national membership on the complete adoption by immigrants of Greece’s dominant cultural idiom – or, to be more exact, of a set of cultural patterns that some, or many, Greeks, wish to represent as their nation’s essential character. Second, Samaras drew a specific boundary, between “the West and the rest” (e.g., Herzfeld 2002), *and* positioned Greece on the western side of it. In the course of my data analysis, I classified such discourses under the conceptual label of “*Europeanness*” (Hesse 2007: 646; emphasis in the original). In the next section, I give historical and theoretical information on (1) the broader boundary that separates “*Europeanness*” from “*non-Europeanness*,” and (2) on the way Greek state elites have striven, throughout the nation-state’s two centuries of existence, to forge a body politic in congruence with “Western” sociocultural norms. This discussion is important, because it situates Greece’s contemporary boundary-making processes vis-à-vis populations seen by most Greeks as non-Western – i.e., the vast majority of the country’s immigrants – into a broader historical and ideological context, and thus renders them significantly more legible. Further, it also situates these Greek processes within the broader European context of inclusion and exclusion. While on a broad scale Europe has been constructed as the home

of whiteness and Christianity (e.g., Goldberg 2006), such hegemonic boundary-making discourses find diverse expressions around the continent, according to national and local specificities (Goldberg 2006). The Greek case presents particular interest, as a country relegated, throughout its statehood, to Europe's material and symbolic margins, despite the centrality of the ancient Greek canon in the continent's hegemonic narratives. The theoretical discussion that follows is anchored in Samaras' boundary-making statement – and many others similar to his within my body of data – and shows this statement in a new, hopefully much more clear light.

IV. EUROPE, GREECE AND THE OTHERS

At the outset of this discussion, a clarification is in order. The section's title uses "Europe" and "Greece" in a way that may suggest the terms denote the social actors who engage in processes of inclusion and exclusion. Such language, however, runs the risk of essentializing the collectivity and assuming a unitary collective actor, internally homogeneous and externally bounded (Brubaker 2004). This is far from what I wish to suggest. "Europe" in particular signifies, in this discussion, what Gerard Delanty (1995) calls a hegemonic discourse with a strong ideological character, forged in order to produce and sustain specific hierarchies. To recall the boundary-work theoretical framework set out in Chapter One, social actors attribute certain traits – in this case, specific cultural patterns and religion – to groups or entities in order to establish similarity and difference (Barth 1969; Gieryn 1983). It is not the traits themselves that are important, however, but, rather, the boundary they serve to produce or sustain, and the hierarchical relations such a boundary produces (e.g., Bourdieu 1994; Massey 2007). Drawing on this theoretical insight and on the work of race theorists I discuss below, I

argue that the boundary that separates the broad category “*Europeanness*” from “*non-Europeanness*” (Hesse 2007: 646, emphasis in the original) persists from the colonial era to the present (Blaut 1992; Goldberg 2006; Hesse 2007; Lentin 2008), and has historically latched on to a variety of markers in order to stay in place and continue to perform its classificatory function. The concept, Delanty argues, has always been constructed not in unity, i.e., to reflect a cultural content shared by its people(s), but in opposition to a succession of Others and with the goal to foster unequal power configurations between the Western European center and its peripheries. Contemporary visions posit a European spirit, based on Latin Christendom, humanist values and liberal social democracy – much like Samaras’ statement indicated. In reality, however, there is no consistent core idea spanning European history. Historically, the hegemonic European discourse has made use of a series of markers to construct and sustain a boundary between the dominant Western core and a series of peripheries (Delanty 1995). In the discussion that follows, I call this boundary “race,” and argue that contemporary discourses that (re)produce this boundary also consist in forms of racism, even if they do not represent difference as biological.

Gerard Delanty (1995) traces the history of Europe’s oppositional self-definition to the 7th century and the rise of Islam – that is, he locates a history of boundary work that predates colonialism. Since then and until the beginning of colonial expansion, Europe defined itself as coterminous to Western Christianity, the latter juxtaposed to the Muslim world. In the late 1400s, race entered the picture, as a framework of ranked categories hierarchically dividing humanity according to biological features, and particularly color (Sanjek 1996). Such notions continued to sustain slavery and colonialism well in the 18th

and 19th centuries (Lentin 2008), until race was discredited scientifically (Armelagos and Goodman 1998; Stocking 1968; Sanjek 1996), but also delegitimized as a discursive term in the European context due to the continent's desire to exorcise the memory of the Holocaust (Goldberg 2006; Lentin 2008), the racially-inflected atrocity that unfolded on Europe's own soil. Colonialism had taken place far away enough to be seen as the history of others, not of Europeans. The Holocaust, however, was Europe's own "family past [...] that must be made to pass" (Goldberg 2006: 337). After the Holocaust, the term "race" was marginalized in social theory, political dialogue and public discourse. Since then, race has been banished to the realms of pseudo-science and is seen as the exceptional property of neo-Nazis or the extreme right (Goldberg 2006; Lentin 2008). Particularly when race came home with post-WWII migration, it could not be known as such – post-colonial migrants became ethnic minorities and cultural groups, people who had an identity rather than a racial label imposed on them (Lentin 2008).

As biological explanations waned in legitimacy after WWII and with new insights into the biology of difference, a new supporting theory became necessary to rationalize the perpetuation of dominance, exploitation and exclusion. James Blaut uses the term "cultural racism" (1992: 289) to describe this contemporary boundary-making discourse, which employs history and essentialized notions of culture to maintain colonial-era boundaries and practices. Charged with proving European superiority without using biology, the new discourse has resorted to culture and history. All important innovations – material, technological, social and political – occurred first in Europe and then diffused to non-European people. At each moment in history, therefore, Europe has been ahead –

materially, technologically, politically and socially. On the other hand, non-Europeans acquired long ago cultural qualities that have blocked their development (Blaut 1992).

Cultural racism, then, Blaut argues, rests on two anti-biological propositions, i.e., that Europeans are not innately superior and that economic and cultural development can bring non-Europeans up to par. Members of what used to be considered inferior races are equally capable to Europeans, but have not been able to realize this capacity; they have not learned to think rationally as mental adults and behave appropriately as social adults. Because the problem is culture, i.e., acquired features instead of innate, this inequality will disappear with time. Until it does, however, each person must be treated in a way suitable to his or her abilities; higher abilities justify higher rewards. Racist practice, Blaut argues, “persists under the guidance of a theory which actually denies the relevance of race” (1992: 290). The contemporary argument, then, is structurally and functionally parallel to biological racism, legitimizing the same practices of exclusion.

On a broad scale, then, Europe has been historically constructed as the place of and for Europeans, the home of whiteness and Christianity (Goldberg 2006). Yet, this hegemonic, exclusionary discourse finds diverse expressions around the continent, according to national and local specificities (Goldberg 2006). In the Greek case, the desire to belong within the boundaries of “Europeanness” reflects the nation’s unique – and strongly problematic – position as “at once the collective spiritual ancestor and a political pariah in today’s “fast capitalist” Europe” (Herzfeld 2002: 903). Enlightenment-era discourses seeking to locate the superior origin of the European civilization promoted an idea of classical Greece as Europe’s racial and cultural progenitor. By an accident of

historic and linguistic geography, people speaking Greek and inhabiting the Greek peninsula inherited this glorious ancestry (Tsoukalas 2000).

Specifically, in the decades preceding Greece's national independence in 1830, members of the Greek-speaking Balkan intelligentsia grabbed on to these idealized origins as soon as they encountered them in Europe, providing the budding nation with a historical destiny and a sense of mission. The Greek struggle against the Ottomans was painted as the fight of classical values against Oriental despotism and the struggle to resurrect the principles of rationality and civilization across the Near East (Tsoukalas 2000). Post-independence, state elites strove to homogenize local and regional culture and language along classical Hellenic models, i.e., in emulation of Western European ideas about Greek language and culture (Herzfeld 2002). This imported idealized image, however, clashed with the living reality of the bulk of the population of the new state – for most, classical “Greece remained an alien and incomprehensible fiction” (Tsoukalas 2000: 35). The sole linguistic and cultural connection with antiquity resided in the teachings and the language of the Orthodox Church, whose conservative, conformist mentality clashed with the progressive, secular and rational interpretations of ancient ideals. Yet efforts to reconcile these diverse traditions into one grand narrative of Hellenism stumbled onto the European classification of Byzantium and Eastern Christianity as Oriental. How could Greeks accept the overall European discourse of civilization, which gives them center-place in the history of the West, while rejecting the part of it that orientalizes a specific aspect of their heritage (Tsoukalas 2000)?

To escape this “imported ideological straitjacket” (Tsoukalas 2000: 37), the young nation-state engaged in some boundary work of its own. On the one hand, and as

Chapter Two also discussed, nationalist historiographers crafted a linear, unbroken ethno-cultural trajectory from the classical antiquity to their day, glorifying the Byzantine era and incorporating it into the national story. They argued that the Greek ethnic group sailed through time with a keen sense of ethnic identity which permitted limited, if any, intermixtures (*inter alia* Karakasidou 1997; Kitromilides 1989). Further, the nation's official discourses developed a Greek brand of Orientalism, which shifted the lines of demarcation between civilization and barbarism to include Byzantium in the former while orientalizing their Muslim, Slav and Albanian neighbors. This included linguistic and religious minorities within the Greek national space (Herzfeld 2002). A line was drawn between "civilized" Greeks on one side and their uncivilized Slav neighbors and own Ottoman-corrupted peasants (Herzfeld 2002). As Samaras' statement indicated, a similar line informs contemporary boundary-making discourses vis-à-vis Greece's new Others – immigrants. And as his statement further indicated, the primary Other in the course of this discussion consists in Muslims, as a statement by one of his party's deputies also confirms.

"We must recognize that immigrants are not all incorporated in the same way," Konstantinos Mousouroulis said on March 10 in the National Assembly. "Those who come from countries of the former Eastern Bloc are incorporated in a different way; Muslims from Asia are incorporated in a different way; those from Africa are incorporated in a different way."

Table 4-13 “Europeanness” Should Determine National Boundaries

Politicians	PASOK	Tangentially present in one parliamentary address (out of 58) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader in his two formal statements published in <i>Eleftherotypia</i> , and during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 15 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address Present in 45 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in two commentaries (by the same staff columnist).
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in two commentaries (by the same staff columnist).
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Tangentially present in one article written by a political scientist.
Opengov		Present in 37 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 38 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

Consequently, people who stepped forward to contest the notion of “Europeanness” focused their arguments on Muslims as well.

Identifying any religious dogma with violence or social unrest is a “great mistake,” the Socialist Prime Minister told his colleagues on February 8. “I want to remind you that the second largest country in the world with a Muslim population is a country which does not consist of Muslims in its majority: India. It has problems outside its borders that derive from neighboring countries, terrorists, etc., but it does not have problems with the Muslim population inside the country, even though they are hundreds

of millions. I spoke about this issue with Indian leaders the day before yesterday, so as to hear their view, and they told me that they do not have a problem, because ‘we have full democracy; we respect their rights fully. They do not feel like second-class citizens.’”

Table 4-14 “Europeanness” Should not Determine National Boundaries

Politicians	PASOK	Articulated by the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Not present in any of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Articulated by the party’s leader during her Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Not present in any of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in one feature.
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals	Present in one article written jointly by two law professors/political scientists.	
Opengov	Not present in any of the 98 comments examined that were submitted in favor of the <i>jus soli</i> bill.	
Facebook	Present in nine out of 470 discussion threads in the pro- <i>jus soli</i> group.	

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, I discussed how people whose voices I “heard” in the course of my study negotiated the concepts of cross-border mobility and ethno-cultural mixture. Views on mobility and mixture constitute the building blocks of the nationalist ideology. As my theoretical discussion demonstrated, nationalism prescribes a view of the world as appropriately divided into distinct, spatially discontinuous units, each inhabited by people who share a bounded, distinct and largely fixed set of attributes and patterns – cognitive, behavioral and even biological.

My analysis in the present chapter demonstrated that people negotiated the concepts of mobility and mixture at graduated levels of abstraction. People brought up and disagreed on the mundane, so to speak, topic of the conditions of entry and residence in the modern nation-state. Second, they argued about the norms that should regulate entry, residence and subsequently potential membership in contemporary nation-states. Moreover, discussions I examined reached a higher level of abstraction, with people arguing on whether mobility and mixture constitute normal or aberrant patterns of human behavior in general, beyond the contemporary socio-historical context of nation-states.

Yet, as I demonstrated, even the most “banal” or technical discussions were informed by deeply ideological and normative underlying ways of thinking about people’s relationship to culture and territory. People who emphasized the risk of mass, uncontrolled entry into Greece’s physical territory and national community alike also conceptualized human mobility as aberrant and dangerous. In this discourse, people who moved were represented as invaders, people who have lost the moral premium that rootedness confers, people who disrespect and violate the authority of states to contain populations and regulate national borders. On the other hand, people who also stressed the need to seal the country’s borders but allowed for some degree of documented or undocumented entry conceptualized human mobility as unfortunate but necessary under the contemporary geopolitical conditions. In this discourse, immigrants who entered Greece were represented as people fleeing adverse circumstances and thus forced to violate the country’s borders – mobility then was still seen as also fundamentally aberrant and undesirable, but acceptable under specific circumstances. On the least nationalist end of the spectrum, people conceptualized mobility as a *right*, and disputed the authority of

states to regulate it given the compliance of states in creating the conditions that force people to move. Further, mobility was represented as beneficial to host states. More specifically, proponents of this view argued that people who pick up and move, rather than uprooted physically and morally, constitute the most creative, dynamic elements of their societies.

Rather than pragmatic assessments of practical matters, then, views on mobility and mixture and the policies that derive from them and largely determine the boundaries and character of the national community and the life chances of immigrants who vie for membership reflect the hold that nationalism has – or, indeed, lacks – on the way people conceptualize collective belonging. This divergence of views from the more to the less nationalist produces diverse schemes of inclusion and exclusion, as my other two data chapters also demonstrate. This conceptual divergence, however, also provides answers to my study's main research questions, as well as confirms the salience and accuracy of theories I discussed in Chapter One and Chapter Two of my dissertation. Briefly, I framed my analysis through a theoretical paradigm that holds that national boundaries are redefined in interaction; in other words, when a collectivity is faced with the task of (re)defining its boundaries, because they are contested, pushed at, or crossed (Barth 1969; Triandafyllidou 2001). Further, I harnessed socially constructivist accounts of nationalism, ethnicity, and culture to argue that it is necessary to examine the degree to which people embrace nationalist notions, as well as whether nationalism is challenged in the face of shifting socio-historical conditions. Findings on mobility and mixture reveal that nationalist views are not an uncontested norm – at least among the people whose voices I “heard” in the course of the present study. On the least nationalist end of the

discursive spectrum, people represented mobility and mixture as elements of dynamism and vigor for receiving societies. Yet it is the mid-range view, which sees mobility as undesirable and abnormal but necessary under certain circumstances, constitutes perhaps a more significant finding. This is because it shows how essentially nationalist views are tweaked to produce different schemes of inclusion and exclusion while preserving the nationalist ideology's fundamental tenets⁴². In other words, this mid-range view shows how the reality of immigration compels people to adjust nationalist views.

The conceptual divergence evinced in the present chapter extends to the concept of “*Europeanness*” (Hesse 2006: 643, emphasis in the original), which has historically informed boundary-making discourses and practices in the Greek national context. This relationship persists in the present debate. In my data, *Europeanness* emerged as a boundary that determines the kind of mobility and mixture that people opposed. Among the things that stand out in these conversations is the fact that Greeks opposed to immigrant membership focused more on Muslims, rather than Albanians, who had occupied the role of the nation's quintessential Other during the past two decades. This is further noteworthy in view of the fact that the second generation that stands to benefit from the proposed law had to be predominantly of Albanian origin, since at the time of this discussion Albanians made up some 70 percent of Greece's immigrants.

⁴² Per Gustafson (2005) detects the same three main “voices” on cross-border mobility, and similarly argues for the significance of the mid-range view in his examination of Swedish debates on dual nationality. Because my study does not engage in a systematic comparison of Greek boundary-making debates with similar debates in other European nations, I do not go into his study in detail.

Chapter 5: (Re)Considering the Norm of Ethnic Descent

I. INTRODUCTION

““You become Greek; you are not born [Greek],”” the woman who gave her first name as Margoula reproduced – scornfully, as the rest of her online comment evinced – the slogan coined to promote the campaign for the expansion of Greek national membership to immigrants, and particularly members of the second generation. Margoula expressed her disdain on the wall of the Facebook group created as a part of this campaign, in order to promote and showcase public support for the *jus soli* legislative initiative. Apart from supporters, however, the group attracted people – like Margoula, who is quoted here, or “the Viper,” who launched the previous chapter – who joined in order to contest the group’s main premise. “RIGHT, YOU ARE BORN GREEK; YOU DO NOT BECOME [GREEK]!!!” this online “guest” “shouted” her disagreement at the group’s regular members, using the inverse slogan, coined and deployed against the proposed legislation by people for whom being Greek is, as this chapter demonstrates, largely a fact of birth.

The group’s regular members and proponents of *jus soli* could have fired back at Margoula with a number of weapons available in their discursive arsenal. Her severe spelling mistakes⁴³, however, related to basic grammatical rules on verb endings, made her an easy target.

“Ms. Margoula, a necessary precondition for acquiring Greek nationality is the sufficient knowledge of the Greek language, which, as it appears, you do not possess,”

⁴³ Her exact phrase, in Greek, was “ΕΛΛΗΝΑΣ ΓΕΝΙΕΣΕ ΔΕΝ ΓΙΝΕΣΕ.”

Elina-Stella, one of the group's regular discussants and administrators, responded. "I am sorry, but you do not make the grade."

Margoula's spelling errors invited the derision of several regular group members⁴⁴, who argued that people with poor knowledge of the Greek language – a foundational ethno-national trait – are not qualified to evaluate anybody else's belonging to the group, or argue on the basis of ethnic purity. Not only this, but their low educational level and far-Right notions of purity arguably disqualify people such as Margoula from belonging to the nation altogether – as I demonstrate in this chapter, many advocates of *jus soli*, such as Elina-Stella, indicated that they would prefer to form a group on the basis of commonality in social beliefs and behaviors, rather than on the basis of shared ethnic traits.

Once the mocking indignation against Margoula had subsided, an occasional group contributor, Nancy, stepped in to conceptualize "Greek" and "Greekness" as the adoption and enactment of specific cultural patterns, rather than as the immutable result of biological ancestry. "I congratulate him [*sic*], who will be able to substantiate and prove his Greekness. What does Greek mean, guys? Is it not funny to think of ourselves as descendants of Socrates? Should I speak of the multitude of tribes that lived on the geographic territory of Greece from antiquity to our day? Should I speak of languages, such as Arvanite⁴⁵, that are still being spoken in my area [...]? I will not say anything. I

⁴⁴ Their comments are not provided here, because they do not differ much from Elina-Stella's statement, and therefore would not add to the discussion.

⁴⁵ Arvanites are Greek nationals whose ancestors moved into the Greek peninsula from what is now Albanian national territory at the end of the 18th century. Arvanites exhibit ethnic Albanian traits, particularly language, but have been fully integrated into the Greek nation, at least on the level of official

am a (Arvanite-Vlach) Greek, and I am such because I grew up here, with the Greek language, and the Greek history, and the Greek culture. And, yes, I am proud that there are people from different nations [αλλοεθνείς], who consider it their honor to raise the Greek flag and [partake in] Greek letters, of whatever descent they may be.”

This conversation took place on January 5, 2010, i.e., a mere two days after the *pro-jus soli* Facebook group had been created. The slogan that Margoula joined to contest, “You become Greek; you are not born [Greek],” was, in fact, the group’s name. As the group’s creator explained, its use was meant to inverse, “in a graspable way, fit for Facebook,” the opposing camp’s position. To wit, the notion of “becoming Greek” intended to dispute the principle that the only way to become a part of the national community was to be born to parents or ancestors were or had been actual or potential⁴⁶ Greek nationals, and instead propose that Greek nationality was something one could *acquire*, given a series of conditions. In other words, it intended to render the nation’s boundaries much more inclusive and permeable. Yet the notion that people may “become Greek” invited contesting interpretations by people who subscribed to its basic inclusionary intent, but disagreed on (1) what “Greek” means, and therefore what it takes to become one, and (2) whether becoming “Greek,” if “Greek” is defined in ethno-cultural terms, is, in fact, a necessary precondition for political membership. On Facebook, this rift within the *pro-jus soli* camp became evident in the early days of the group’s existence, as people who joined pondered the slogan’s meaning and significance.

narrative and historiography, not least due to the prominence of their participation in the 1821-1830 revolutionary struggle for statehood (e.g., Gefou-Madianou 1999).

⁴⁶ Subjects of the former Ottoman Empire whose ethnic traits and/or specific locality qualified them for Greek nationality, but who never acquired it for any number of reasons (Christopoulos 2012).

“Nobody is born with national sentiment,” said Vangelis, an occasional group participant, on January 7, i.e., two days after the conversation cited above. “The group’s title is correct to the degree that it recognizes this truth. Beyond this, it is up to us as a state to gauge how many we may accept into our country lawfully and try to embrace. Just as it has happened with so many who chose to integrate into Hellenism.”

“Why should someone integrate into Hellenism?” retorted Paco, a regular group member using a soccer star’s name as his online alias. “Can there not be mutual respect between people with a different culture?” he asked, to argue, as he explained later in the conversation, that the adoption of Greek “customs and mores,” should not be a prerequisite to membership.

“Why when someone lives, works, is taxed, contributes, breathes for a country, should he [*sic*] not be its member with equal rights?” Thomas, a frequent contributor, pitched in to expand on Paco’s argument. “Has he not earned it? [...] Why has Australia recognized thousands of Greeks as Australian nationals?”

The first dialogue cited above starts with the main dilemma faced by the people whose voices were “heard” in the context of this study. To reiterate, the dilemma is this: Should national membership be limited to people who are born Greek, in other words to people who are, because of their parents’ ethnic or national membership, considered Greek at birth? Or should it be expanded to immigrants and their children, in other words people who are not a part of the Greek ethnic unit? And if so, what does such expansion entail? In other words, if descent is to no longer be the primary, and indeed the only, marker of collective boundaries, what should the new markers be? The second dialogue

cited proposes two such boundary-making schemes, which are indeed the two main answers to this question found within my body of data.

The previous data chapter dealt with nationalism's foundational assumptions – to wit, views on whether people tend to or indeed should move from their native lands and mix with people who exhibit different ethno-cultural traits, or whether they should stay put and co-exist with their own ethnic kind. This chapter moves on to the crux of my study's research question: faced with the *de facto* presence of immigrants, how do Greeks (re)evaluate the dominant model of ethno-homogeneous collective belonging? In accordance with the boundary-work theoretical lens that frames my analysis, this chapter examines the different markers that people put forward to define the boundaries of the collective unit. To recall the theoretical framework explicated in Chapter One, social actors emphasize different traits to argue for similarity or difference *not* because these traits are actually more salient than others in the (self-)definition of the groups or individuals in the process of being classified, but according to the boundary schemes these social actors wish to produce (Barth 1969; Gieryn 1983). In the present chapter, then, I examine the way different actors emphasized different axes of collective identification and how they represented them also according to the boundaries they aimed to draw.

Chapter Structure

Unlike my other two data chapters, the present chapter does not have its own theory section, as it examines the topic of ethnic descent, and therefore draws on the extensive theoretical argument provided in Chapter Two. In the present chapter, I reiterate the main points made during that argument in the beginning of Section II, which

examines the conceptual category of “ethnic descent.” To recall my coding scheme outlined in Chapter Three, the conceptual category “ethnic descent” exhibited variation along the properties of “conceptual validity” and “salience.” In other words, debate revolved around (1) whether we may speak of ethnic descent, what it means, and how it operates, and has operated historically, and (2) whether ethnic descent, however it is conceptualized, should determine Greece’s national boundaries. I begin by examining the views of people who argued that ethnic descent should be the primary, indeed the sole, criterion for national boundaries. In the process of this discussion, I also examine how these people represented ethnic descent conceptually. Subsequently, I examine the “*Ithageneia* versus *Ipikootita*” debate – a debate spurred by the fact that the Greek legal term for nationality, *ithageneia*, has strong ethnic connotations. This debate leads into a discussion of the views of people who disputed both the conceptual validity and salience of ethnic descent. I complete the discussion on ethnic descent by analyzing conversations that pitted the membership claims of immigrants to the membership claims of different cohorts of people with Greek ethnic traits who moved to Greece largely in the same manner and time period as immigrants did, or of the descendants of Greek emigrants still residing abroad.

After completing the discussion on the category “ethnic descent,” I go on to examine the conceptual category “ethno-cultural content,” whose complete adoption by immigrants was put forward mostly by the political center Right as a membership criterion alternative to ethnic descent yet fully required prior to nationality acquisition. This category exhibited conceptual differentiation along the properties of salience and adoptability. In other words, the debate here revolves around whether immigrants should

be required to adopt Greece's dominant ethno-cultural idiom as a condition of entry into the national community, but also around whether it is possible for people to shed the ethno-cultural patterns they acquired in their country of origin – or in their family environment, in the case of the second generation – and replace them with those that prevail among the host country's dominant ethnic group.

The chapter's last major section examines boundary-making schemes that reject both ethnic descent and ethnic assimilation as criteria for collective belonging, and instead premise national membership on “the principle of stakeholding” (e.g., Bauböck *et al.* 2006: 19) – in other words, the notion that national membership should be granted on the basis of the degree to which prospective members, whatever their ethnicity, have linked their fates to that of the collective unit. The conceptual category “stakeholding” exhibited differentiation along the properties of validity and salience – to wit, can we argue that immigrants do in fact develop such ties, and, even if they do, do such ties warrant national membership? Among the advocates of stakeholding, differentiation occurred in terms of to which segments of the collective unit people tie their fates, and the kind of social attributes, beliefs and behaviors that should be viewed as indicative of such adherence.

II. THE PRINCIPLE OF ETHNIC DESCENT

Introduction

In Chapter Two, I provided a detailed theoretical and historical discussion of the notion of ethnic descent, or ethnicity, in the context of nationalism in general and of Greek nationalism in particular. I defined ethnicity, following the constructivist school of thought, as the belief in biological or cultural commonality – a belief that develops

through common historical experiences and joint political action (Jenkins 2008; Hughes 1948; Weber 1922). The direction of causality here is crucial. As I argued in Chapter Two, it is not common descent that compels people to belong together within the same collective political unit, but shared experiences within such a unit that, with the passage of time, foster the development of shared sociocultural patterns, and, consequently, the impression of pre-existing, primordial commonality. In the socio-historical context of nationalism, commonality and difference are represented as essential and immutable, thus creating sociocultural and political boundaries also represented and enforced as rigid and impermeable (e.g., Karakasidou 1997; Verdery 1993, 1994). In the context of Greek nationalism, ethnic descent became the primary criterion of political membership even prior to official statehood (Christopoulos 2012; Vogli 2008; Tsitselikis 2006). What is important, however, was the manner in which descent was understood and substantiated, and, consequently, how it operated as a marker of collective boundaries. Chapter Two explicates that the new state looked for its nationals among members of the Ottoman Empire's Orthodox Christians – a population cohort of significant internal linguistic and cultural diversity. As I demonstrated, ethnicity was largely substantiated by people's willingness to adopt and enact the dominant notion of "Greekness" – in other words, to adopt and enact the dominant ethnic and cultural patterns, and subscribe to the view of the Greek nation as a primordial social unit with a linear, unbroken historical ethno-cultural trajectory since antiquity. In this way, it operated to exclude people who did not adhere to this dominant model (e.g., Christopoulos 2012; Karakasidou 1997). In time, the concept of Greek descent became normalized to the point that people reproduced it literally and without taking into account its historical contradictions. Yet the prospect of a

mass cohort of new nationals, who may not claim Greek ethnicity, brings the question of descent to the forefront once more. The discursive segments I cite and critically analyze below exemplify this re-examination.

Ethnic Descent: Valid and Salient

The letter he was about to read out loud in the Greek National Assembly should be heard more closely by “those who think that Greek national membership has nothing to do with blood, and this is racist, etc.; the usual nonsense that we hear recently,” far-Right MP Ilias Polatidis told his colleagues during his March 11, 2010 parliamentary address. The letter’s sender was, in Polatidis’ words, “an average Greek.” Followed by Polatidis’ own comments, addressed primarily to his strongest ideological opponents, the excerpt of this letter read during deliberations on the proposed *jus soli* legislative initiative intended to establish that the Greek nation is, in fact, an ethno-biological unit.

“A village in Armenia was settled by Greeks in 801 B.C. I was born in that village 1200 years later. Am I Armenian? Am I maybe Russian, because the last three generations of my ancestors were born in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and we have all attended Russian school and university? No, all these play no role whatsoever. In 1974, our entire poor, communist village was collecting money for our Cyprus,’ gentlemen of the Left,” Polatidis said, addressing his colleagues after he had finished reading the letter’s excerpt. “Why was the poor communist village in Armenia collecting [money]?” he continued.

“Because they were nationals and felt they had some legal relation to Cyprus? Is this why? How will the Albanian’s or the Pakistani’s blood turn into water? Because, if they can betray the *genus* to which they belong, that is if they allow us to call them

Greek, will they not “spit on” Greece with the first chance they get? If you are not born Greek, you cannot become Greek.”

In this statement, then, Polatidis represents the ethnic unit as a community of actual biological relatedness. The fact that he conceptualizes Greek descent as literally biological, and indeed explicitly asserts an unbroken blood line from antiquity to the present, is notable in itself. Yet arguably more important is the boundary scheme that Polatidis’ notion of descent stands to produce. More specifically, Polatidis draws a specific boundary, between people who are considered to be of Greek biological ancestry, and immigrants, who are not. Of course, and as many opponents of the primacy of ethnic descent as a marker of national belonging pointed out, neither Polatidis nor anyone else may gauge this kind of membership with any degree of certainty or scientific validity, particularly given the past of fluid, permeable ethnic boundaries in the Greek peninsula prior to statehood and nationalization. The boundary that Polatidis drew, then, effectively translates into a boundary between the people who are already considered Greek, on the basis of the ideological schema of Greek ethno-racialism (Christopoulos 2012) that Chapter Two explicates, and between prospective members of the nation – immigrants – who may make no claims to such ancestry.

Further, Polatidis argues that it is this kind of ethno-biological relatedness that fosters feelings of belonging and community, and this is the reason why ethnic descent should be the primary marker of collective boundaries. In other words, he discusses the ramifications of the boundary-making scheme he proposes, and opposes the social configurations proposed by the advocates of *jus soli* also on the basis of the social outcomes he foresees. The debates on the multiple effects inclusion or exclusion are

foreseen to have on the collective body form the topic of the next and final data chapter, although glimpses of different arguments in these debates may be caught in the present chapter as well.

Back to the topic of ethnic descent, in the previous chapter I argued that discourses of biological difference have gradually given way after World War II to discourses of essential and immutable cultural difference designed and deployed to produce and sustain very much the same ethno-racial boundaries. Delegitimized in Europe after the Holocaust, notions of biological difference became limited to the discursive arena of the far Right. In the conversations that took place in the Greek National Assembly on the topic of the proposed *jus soli* provision, Polatidis was the only elected representative who openly and strongly asserted this notion of biological relatedness. The idea that Greeks constitute an actual ethno-biological unit and biological ties should determine national membership was also scorned in all mainstream newspapers examined for the purposes of this study, including *Proto Thema*, the bastion of right-wing populism. However, statements that represented ethno-biological descent as a valid concept and asserted its salience as a criterion of national membership prevailed in the online submissions of semi-anonymous discussants, arguably because their statements were not subject to the same kind of public scrutiny as the statements of elected national representatives. On the government-sponsored online forum, the notion of shared ancestry prevailed within the body of submissions largely orchestrated, as Chapter Three explains, by the far Right. For example, two comments submitted within the first twenty-four hours that comments on the proposed bill were being accepted read thus:

“Someone who does not belong to the Greek *genus* may not be called Greek. [...] This land is the property of people with Greek Blood passed on by Our Forefathers.⁴⁷”

Or:

“People who have nothing to do with the spirit and the DNA [*sic*] of Greeks cannot just become Greek.”

Similar representations on descent had a strong presence on the wall of the Facebook group created to oppose the *jus soli* legislative initiative. Below I cite such an example, in the form of a dialogue that took place on January 24:

“I believe that, to call someone Greek, he must above all have a Greek mother and a Greek father!!!!” wrote Anna, an infrequent contributor to the group’s discussions. “A person who has a different descent and just lives in Greece is not Greek!!! He will never have real nationality!!”

“Or at least one parent Greek,” replied Kostas, one of the group’s strongest contributors, who had disclosed to the group that his mother was French. However, on the basis of descent through his father which he argued carries more weight, he asserted he was 75 percent Greek. “Anyone who has no Greek blood at all has nothing to do with Greece, and this is why foreign immigrants that have come here will never become Greek.”

While in the Parliament Polatidis was the only one to bring up blood in an overt, literal manner, members of his party as well as members of the center-Right New Democracy naturalized the Greek political unit in more implicit ways. Another member of Polatidis’ party took care to dispel the impression that their talk of descent translated into literal notions of biological commonality. Instead, Polatidis’ fellow far-Right deputy

⁴⁷ In the original Greek, as in the translated sentence, it was not clear whether the author meant that the land or the blood had been passed on by the forefathers.

Thanos Plevris gave a different interpretation to the notion of common blood [ὄμαιομον] propagated by his party as a criterion for membership. His party's intention, Plevris said during his March 11 parliamentary address, was "to defend the nation-state. We do not consider Greece a multicultural society; we consider Greece to have a dominant culture, Greek culture, to have a nation with spiritual and historical references."

The biological definition offered by his fellow LAOS member, which, as I demonstrate later into this chapter, was heavily disputed by the Socialists and the two parties of the Left, was not what his party means, Plevris clarified. "When we speak of common blood," he said, "we do not refer to those things heard earlier, to DNA or anything else. We mean there is a common descent, a sense of common descent, which goes back centuries. All of us here have the sense that we are Greek. Nobody asks for a blood analysis; if you have been Greek for three, four, five or six centuries, or a millennium. All of us, however, have this common descent that goes back centuries as our point of reference, and in this sense we feel that we partake into what we call Greek nation. A person who has come here, whose father belongs to a different nation, does not have this sense, just because he [*sic*] happened to attend Greek school. He loves Greece, possibly he feels it as his second homeland, but he does not have this sense of common descent."

In Plevris' statement of clarification, three points stand out. First, it points to the fact that he attempted to denounce a blood-based view of the nation, which would brand his party as subscribing to racist views and thus relegate it to the far-Right end of the ideological spectrum. Second, much like his fellow deputy of the far Right, Plevris represents ethnic descent, or, in his representation, a sense thereof, as the element that

fosters a sentiment of belonging to the collective unit, and therefore ensures social solidarity and cohesion – a discussion that forms a major topic in the next data chapter. Third, although seemingly contradictory to Polatidis’ statement, which invoked blood, Plevris drew the exact same boundary his colleague did. In other words, he limited national membership to those who may, at the time this conversation is taking place, already claim ethnic descent.

Besides, “a sense of descent that goes back centuries” re-naturalizes the ethno-national unit implicitly – much like discourses that argued that people only become Greek through birth to Greek parents, even if they did not mention blood explicitly. In this sense, discursive segments coded as representing biological descent as valid and salient belong to members of the center-Right party as well, although the party’s official position, articulated in most of its deputies’ addresses during the *jus soli* debate, put forward ethnic assimilation, rather than ethnic descent, as its key criterion of membership.

“You’re creating, artificially, test-tube Greeks,” LAOS MP Konstantinos Aivaliotis charged his pro-*jus soli* colleagues during his March 10 parliamentary address. Similarly, center-Right MP Athanasios Davakis spoke, during his March 10 parliamentary address, of immigrants who “in a legal way, they become Greek with a direct line of descent from the Greek *genus*.”

Table 5-1 Representing “Ethnic Descent” as “Valid” and “Salient”

Elected Officials	PASOK	Not present
	ND	Present in three parliamentary addresses (out of 46) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 33 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals	Not present	
Open Gov	Present in 30 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.	
Facebook	Present in 24 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.	

Ithageneia versus *Ipikootita*

What Davakis’ statement reveals is the centrality of the concept of *genus* in characterizing and demarcating the Greek national community. What’s more, the biological connotations of *genus* extend to the term used in the Greek legal code, *ithageneia*, to denote formal political membership (nationality). The Greek legislator’s choice of the term, rather than the legally synonymous *ipikootita* or *idiotita tou politis* (Papasiopi-Pasia 1992 in Christopoulos 2012 and in Vogli 2008), which have political, rather than ethnic, connotations⁴⁸, reflects the centrality of *genus* in the demarcation of

⁴⁸ Directly translated, *ipikootita* denotes the state of being a subject, i.e., liv[ing] in the territory of, enjoy[ing] the protection of, and ow[ing] allegiance to a sovereign power or state (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/subject>). While the noun *ipikootita* alludes to a relation of subjection associated with monarchical rather than republican regimes, and is therefore seldom used, the nouns *ipikoos* (subject) or *politis* (citizen) are used rather than *ithagenis*, which means native. *Idiotita tou politis* translates into liberal citizenship (the direct translation is “the status of being a citizen”) in its Marshallian sense, but the

the Greek political community (Christopoulos 2012: 35; for a detailed discussion, please see Chapter Two). Therefore, were the *jus soli* bill to pass, immigrants' children would be granted access to Greek *ithageneia* – which for many of the bill's opponents translated into membership in the Greek *genus*, i.e., in the Greek ethnic unit, rather than in the Greek political community. People who raised objections on the terminological basis of *ithageneia* argued that it would be impossible to make someone ethno-biologically Greek. However, they also took the chance to argue against nationality and propose different, less complete kinds of membership – broadly attributed in the literature as “denizenship” or “quasi-citizenship” (e.g., Bauböck *et al.* 2006: 10).

“You grant, then, *ithageneia*,” center-Right MP Anastasios Nerantzis said on March 10, addressing the Socialist cabinet member Giannis Ragkousis, whose ministry had crafted and introduced the *jus soli* bill. “Truly, Mr. Minister, have you wondered what *ithageneia* means? Conceptually, etymologically, it comes from the words *ithis* [*ιθύς*], which means ‘direct’ [*εὐθύς*], and *genus*⁴⁹. The person who has nationality is someone who comes directly from someone else’s genealogical line. I don’t think I come from the line of some Buddhist, Brahman, yellow, or black, without this meaning that I consider myself better than him [*sic*],” he said.

Nerantzis attacked *ithageneia* on etymological grounds, but did not propose an alternative type of membership for immigrants. Others, however, argued that, instead of the type of membership equating them to people with Greek ethnic descent, immigrants

term and its ideological connotations were not introduced into Greek discourse until the 1990s (Christopoulos 2012: 35-36).

⁴⁹ Whether Davakis’ etymological explanation is accurate or not falls beyond the scope of my expertise. What I deem important here is the way *he* understands the term and deploys etymology to construct his argument, rather than the actual accuracy of his explanation.

should be granted *ipikootita*, i.e., full political membership minus the ethnic component. The argument was made, more than anywhere else, in online discussions against the proposed law; in Opengov and Facebook alike. A quote by a “guest” to the pro-*jus soli* Facebook group encapsulates this argument. Stavros, an anti-*jus soli* online discussant active in both Facebook groups examined, put the issue thus during one of his “visits” to the wall of the pro-*jus soli* group on January 10:

“*Ithageneia* = [birth] to two Greek parents is ONE THING... *Ipikootita* = I am from Capernaum, I and my wife both... I take *IPIKOOTITA* in five years... that is, I live in Greece, my children and I who are Capernaumites, and respecting the laws of the country that hosts me, I have the same citizenship rights as any Greek... He is not Greek..... He is Capernaumite....Understood????” [...] No *ithageneia* to immigrants..... Only *ipikootita* under conditions, as it happens everywhere, in all countries.....”

Indeed, the argument that immigrants could not and should not be granted *ithageneia* flourished in online discourses against the proposed law, while it was completely absent from newspapers. In the Parliament, objections to granting *ithageneia* were raised by only six MPs; three from the far-Right LAOS party and three from center-Right New Democracy.

I include the “*ithageneia* versus *ipikootita*” debate in the discussion for three reasons. First, its presence within my data makes its inclusion imperative. Second, while it does not add new conceptual dimensions to the category “ethnic descent,” the two terms’ conflation confirms how deeply normalized is among some Greeks the idea that the political community must correspond with the ethnic. Third, because this conflation was used as an additional argument against *jus soli* – to wit, even people who conceded

that *ithageneia* is a legal term argued that the Greek legislator's choice dictates that access to nationality should be ethnic-based.

It's true that the Greek language uses the term "*ithageneia*" to denote the legal bond between a person and a state, said center-Right MP Konstantinos Tzavaras on March 11. If this were not the case, however, the terms *ithageneia* and *ipikootita* "would not have the same conceptual value." In other languages, for example English, this "legal relationship" which denotes the bond between a person and a state, is attributed with clarity with the term "citizenship," Tzavaras said. On this basis, he argued, we must pay increased attention to *ithageneia*'s ethnic connotations. The proposed law, he said, rests on "a very serious political choice," with serious consequences for the nation and its history, i.e., the choice to replace the naturalization process with "automatic procedures." Nationality law, he continued, and the way Greece accepts foreigners into the national community "must respect *ithageneia* with all its conceptual and political wealth."

In other words, Tzavaras argued that *ithageneia* dictates that automatic, birthright nationality should be limited to Greeks, whereas immigrants and their Greek-born children should go through a process of naturalization. A similar argument was put forward by the far Right – rather than diverse access to membership, they proposed diverse – and indeed graduated – forms of membership.

"*Ithageneia* and *ipikootita* are two different concepts," said far-Right MP Alexandros Chrysanthakopoulos during his March 9 parliamentary address. "You do not use *ipikootita*, because if someone is the subject of a state and is a criminal offender, it will be taken away from him [*sic*]. But if *ithageneia* is granted – which should not be granted – it will never be taken away."

As may be expected, the ruling Socialists, but also the bill's online proponents, stepped forward to counter the arguments described so far in the present subsection by asserting that *ithageneia* is a legal term, despite its etymological connotations.

For those enamored of the Classical Greek language, *ithageneia* does indeed “denote the native, him [*sic*] who has no racial mixtures,” said PASOK MP Magia Tsokli during her March 10 address. The word, Tsokli said, “bears the burden of its history, and of course of the way in which we interpret it.” Perhaps, Tsokli continued, we should have a “correct” term such as the English citizenship [*sic*] that clearly refers to the legal bond between a person and a state, “with all the rights and responsibilities that such a bond entails. Perhaps we should create this term.”

While Tsokli conceded the etymological grounds for conflation, online discussants expressed themselves more forcefully.

“I am sick of reading [...] *ipikootita* is one thing, and *ithageneia* is another,” wrote Elina-Stella, a regular discussant in the pro-*jus soli* Facebook group on January 8. “*Ithageneia* denotes the status of being a citizen [*ιδιότητα του πολίτη*] with rights and responsibilities.”

Similarly, in the Parliament, PASOK MP Theodora Tzakri stated, on March 11, that the two terms “correspond fully conceptually, and do not constitute anything but the legal and political bond that connects a person to a state. [...] And nationality is not the reward for someone's racial [*φωλετική*] descent.”

Table 5-2 “*Ithageneia* versus *Ipikootita*”

		Argument: <i>Ithageneia</i> connotes membership on the basis of ethnicity, and should not be extended to immigrants.	Argument: <i>Ithageneia</i> is a legal term that denotes formal membership in a state. As a legal term, it has no ethnic connotations.
Elected Officials	PASOK	Not present	Present in three parliamentary addresses (out of 58) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Present in three parliamentary addresses (out of 46) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.	Present in one parliamentary address (out of 46) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Not present	Not present
	LAOS	Present in three parliamentary address (out of 33) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.	Not present
	SYRIZA	Not present	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present	Present in one feature.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present	Not present
Public Intellectuals	Not present	Not present	
Open Gov	Present in 38 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.	Present in two out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill, and in one out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.	
Facebook	Present in 18 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.	Present in eight out of 470 discussion threads in the pro- <i>jus soli</i> group.	

Ethnic Descent: Invalid and Not Salient

Apart from taking a stance in the “*ithageneia* versus *ipikootita*” debate, Tzakri’s statement also paves the way to discuss how the notion of ethnic descent was disputed in my data. Socialists, like Tzakri, as well as deputies from the two parties of the Left represented in the Greek National Assembly contested the notion of descent as (1) essentially invalid, (2) less salient to national belonging than other dimensions of collective identification, (3) an instrument of exclusion, historically as well as in the present instance, and (4) a legal norm that, depending on its practical applications, may or may not foster an ethnic-based political community.

“Woe betide, if Hellenism were just a matter of DNA,” the Socialist Prime Minister George Papandreou told his fellow parliamentarians during his February 8 address. “We would wonder how many in this room could be members of the Parliament. Hellenism is a matter of values, concepts; it is language, and humanitarian letters, and a worldview.”

Papandreou attacked biological descent on two grounds – not only as a concept whose literal application would disqualify many, if not most, contemporary Greeks from membership, but also as something that is less salient to membership than embracing the cultural patterns associated with the category “Greek.” As a matter of fact, people who attacked ethnic descent simultaneously put forward axes of identification they deemed more salient. Apart from cultural patterns – put forward by some Socialists like Papandreou, but mostly by the center Right, as I demonstrate farther into this chapter – the notion of civic and social ties that supersede descent was also proposed.

The proposed law introduces “the principle of the human,” Socialist deputy Sofia Sakorafa said, during her March 9 parliamentary address. “Against the view that says that a person who lives somewhere acquires vital ties so strong to that place, that irrespective of birth or parental descent, it is fit that he [*sic*] belongs to the political unit of that place, there exists the view that argues based on *jus sanguinis*, which stands on the theory of racial purity and which aims to exclude all those who have a different ethnic descent and cultural identity.” The idea that Sakorafa put forward corresponds to the principle of stakeholding (e.g., Bauböck *et al.* 2006: 19), discussed in this chapter’s final main section, prior to its concluding remarks. This way of demarcating the national community, on the basis of the degree to which people have linked their fates to that of the collective unit, corresponds to the view propagated by the third set of “voices” within my body of data, namely to the people who wish to separate ethnic from political membership altogether. In the political arena, this discursive camp consists of a few members of the Socialist Party, like Sakorafa, but mostly of members of the two parties of the Left. The latter, along with online discussants, took the lead in pointing out the notion’s lack of conceptual validity.

“Unless I am mistaken, Mr. Plevris – I heard your speech – you referred at some point to Thucydides and common blood [*όμαιομον*],” SYRIZA MP Anastasios Kourakis said during his March 10 parliamentary address, addressing his comment to far-Right MP Athanasios Plevris. Nowadays, Kourakis continued, one may not seriously argue by making reference to shared DNA. “Because so many blood mixtures have occurred, that one may not say anything.”

Online discussants were more scathing, as evinced by the Opengov comment cited below, which castigated “the irrationality that borders on nationalist paranoia.”

Descent, the comment stated, should by no means determine political membership,

“[u]nless some think that Greeks have some sort of chromosomal particularity that distinguishes them from other people. [...] The way they are going, they will ask for people’s teeth to be counted, like they used to do with horses.”

Discussants on the wall of the pro-*ius soli* Facebook group expressed their disdain in a more playful manner, as the two comments cited below indicate.

“With in-vitro, are you born Greek?” a regular discussant, Lampros asked on January 24. Similarly, another semi-regular participant mocked the notion that common descent should determine membership, because it guarantees sentiments of solidarity and allegiance.

“You shouldn’t trust anyone, unless you have the same color eyes,” Panos wrote on January 30, inciting virtual laughter among his interlocutors. Laughing aside, however, people who argued against ethnic descent on conceptual grounds also highlighted the fact that notions of membership on the basis of biology have historically operated as a principle of exclusion that has hurt Greeks as well. Sakorafa’s comment cited above included this argument, which also featured strongly in articles written by journalists and public intellectuals.

“Scientists know that blood that does not have national or racial identities. That humans are one species, irrespective of external traits and cultural or social differences. That your homeland is where you live. Even more so, where you are born,” wrote columnist Richardos Someritis in *To Vima* on January 21. Such things should be “self-

evident,” Someritis continued. If they are not for Karatzaferis and Samaras [i.e., the leaders of the far and center Right], that is their problem. “Woe to us, if it is the country’s problem as well...” (Someritis 2010).

“What does *jus sanguinis* mean?” Socialist cabinet minister Theodora Tzakri asked her colleagues on March 11. “It means, very simply, that for someone to obtain Greek nationality, it is necessary that, at his [*sic*] time of birth, his parent must also have Greek nationality, irrespective of whether the parent obtained this nationality at birth or through naturalization. That is, the principle of blood does not mean that, for someone to obtain Greek nationality, his parent must absolutely have Greek descent and ethnicity [*εθνικότητα*]. And, of course, this law does not ensure in any way the purity of our race [*φολή*]. The word ‘blood’ should not mislead us. *Jus sanguinis* means that, whoever is born to parents who have the nationality of a state, obtains this parental nationality at birth automatically; not that only those who belong to a certain race become nationals. This clarification is necessary, because some that survive politically by cultivating a climate of insecurity and fear to the Greek people on purpose or due to ignorance, react to the proposed bill by arguing that we give away Greek nationality and change violently the composition of the Greek population. They conceal that, with the existing [nationality] code, children of foreigners that had obtained Greek nationality through naturalization, automatically obtain Greek nationality at birth, since they are born to Greek parents.”

What Tzakri aims to achieve with this statement is to strike a blow at the normality of ethnic descent – a normality that rests to a large degree on the conflation of legal and sociocultural norms and concepts, as the previous subsection on the

terminology dispute made evident. In her statement, then, Tzakri attempted to disassociate the *legal* norm of *jus sanguinis* from the *sociocultural* norm of an ethnically defined national community, and instead emphasize that *jus sanguinis* merely means that the formal status of nationality passes from parent to child, no matter how it was acquired by the former and no matter her ethnic traits. In the paragraphs that follow, I demonstrate how some of the law's opponents defended *jus sanguinis* as a legal norm used historically and up to that moment to construct, reflect, and sustain specific sociocultural norms and configurations, and then ride these opponents' train of thought to transition to a discussion on the membership claims of Greek *omogeneis*, i.e., people with Greek ethnic traits or of Greek national descent also vying for membership in different ways. In the context of the debate examined in my dissertation, these cohorts' claims were pitted against the claims of immigrants, evincing a range of views on the debate of "blood" against "soil." Before turning to these discussions, however, I provide a table that gives detailed information on the frequency and distribution within my data of views that disputed the salience and validity of ethnic descent.

Table 5-3 Representing “Ethnic Descent” as “Conceptually Invalid” and “Not Salient”

Elected Officials	PASOK	Articulated by the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in over 30 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Present in two parliamentary addresses (out of 46) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Articulated by the party’s leader during her Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in one parliamentary address (out of seven) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Articulated by the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 60 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in one commentary and five features.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in three commentaries (two by the same staff columnist).
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in three commentaries (two by the same staff columnist) and two features (by the same staff writer).
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Present in one commentary.
Public Intellectuals	Present in the articles of five law professors, one political scientist, one literary theorist, and one labor researcher.	
Open Gov	Present in 15 out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.	
Facebook	Present in 50 out of 470 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.	

The way in which opponents of the proposed law also focused on ethnic descent as a legal principle, i.e., *jus sanguinis*, is encapsulated in the March 11 parliamentary address of far-Right deputy Thanos Plevris, who posited that he and his party “defend the regime that exists in Greek law from 1821 [i.e., the year of the Greek national revolution] until today, [...], *jus sanguinis*, as the dominant principle in Greek nationality law [...].” His historical statement is not entirely accurate, as descent did not become the primary criterion of membership until 1827 (e.g., Christopoulos 2012; Vogli 2008). What is

important, however, is the fact that Plevris and his party did not emphasize the historical primacy of *jus sanguinis* solely in order to argue for the exclusion of immigrants, but also in order to demand the unconditional inclusion of anyone who belongs to the Greek *genus*, irrespective of their lack of actual ties with the Greek body politic. In the following subsection, which completes the wider discussion on “ethnic descent,” I examine conversations coded during my analytical process under the label “*Omogeneis* versus Immigrants.” Much like the “*Ithageneia* versus *Ipikootita*” debate, the discussion that follows does not expand the conceptual spectrum of “ethnic descent,” nor does it add radically new elements to my overall argument. Yet it highlights the fact that the proposed law constitutes a transition – at least an attempted one – from an understanding of the Greek nation on the basis of blood, i.e., (putative) ethno-biological ties, to an understanding on the basis of soil, i.e., ties that develop from living together in the same political community. I begin the discussion by providing background information on who the population cohorts bundled under the label “*omogeneis*” are, their (historically shifting) positions vis-à-vis the boundaries of the Greek national community, and what these histories say about how ethnic descent has operated and how it comes under fire.

Blood against Soil: *Omogeneis* versus Immigrants

In Greek, the term *omogeneis*, i.e., people of the same (Greek) *genus*, is used to denote two distinct, but also internally diverse, cohorts. The first – and easier to define and grasp – consists of Greek emigrants, i.e., Greek nationals who left the country mostly in two waves, as well as these emigrants’ descendants to the nth generation. Between 1890 and 1914, almost one-sixth of Greece’s population emigrated to the United States and Egypt. Between 1950 and 1973, more than one million Greeks went to work at

industrialized nations of Northern Europe and United States (Kasimis and Kassimi 2004). For descendants of Greek emigrants, nationality is administratively “confirmed” rather than acquired, once a direct ancestor is located in Greek municipal registries. This process of confirmation, rather than acquisition, reflects the fact that descendants of Greeks are considered Greek, no matter how many generations have elapsed during which there has been no contact with the country, or nationality has remained unclaimed – in other words, Greece’s *jus sanguinis* is generationally unlimited (Christopoulos 2012). Emigrants entered the *jus soli* debate because of a pending request that they be able to vote in Greek national elections from their place of residence – *jus soli* opponents juxtaposed the continued absence of such provisions, which would make it easier for emigrants to enact their national membership, with the government’s “haste” to make immigrants full members of the Greek political community. This argument was put forward primarily by members of the center and far Right in the Parliament.

“Greeks of the Diaspora, who are the great strength of Hellenism [...] matter less in PASOK’s mind than what it is trying to do today. [...] Can we deprive Greeks of the ability to shape the fate of the land?” center-Right MP Prokopis Pavlopoulos asked his colleagues on March 9.

Or, as far-Right MP Ourania Papandreou-Papadaki also put it on March 9: “Why does the Greek state not protect the rights and the obligations of Greek *omogeneis* who live abroad first [...] but rather the rights of people who do not know Greek affairs, do not know Greek history; [who] are foreign to Greek customs and mores?”

In response, the governing party stood behind its legislative initiative, while conceding the Right’s argument in favor of generationally unlimited *jus sanguinis* –

which should nevertheless be paired with *jus soli* in response to the country's new demographic reality.

Exclusive, “inflexible” *jus sanguinis* is not only outdated, it is also unfair, PASOK MP Ioannis Vlatas told his colleagues on March 10. “We accept outright – and rightfully so; I do not say the opposite – as Greeks those descendants of Greeks who have cut their ties to our country, no matter how many generations of voluntary estrangement, because of the principle of blood. On the contrary, we refuse to grant Greek nationality to the people who were born, educated, worked, contributed, lived in our country, because of the same reason. We are proud that there are Greeks outside our country's borders – even though they may not speak our language and even if many of them may not know where our country is – but we turn our backs to second-generation immigrants, who have not known any other homeland apart from Greece, who did not learn to speak any other language, who proudly raised the Greek flag in school parades.”

Conversations pitting immigrants against emigrants, or the reverse, took place mostly in the Parliament and in online fora; journalists and public intellectuals ignored the topic for the most part. Comments by online discussants did not differ much from comments made by politicians and cited above – except for one comment expressing a position all the way to the “soil” end of the “blood-soil” continuum; a position that I did not encounter anywhere else in my body of data, except in one more Opengov submission.

“I agree completely with the granting of Greek nationality to foreigners' children born in Greece. Apart from this, I want to talk about all that's being said in here about granting Greek emigrants the right to vote. What gives?? Why should someone have the right to decide who governs me, without experiencing the problems and situations that I face? Is it

conceivable that people who have never stepped foot in Greece, or who come only to vacation in the islands or, at best, to attend their cousin's wedding be able to choose who will be deciding for my life?"

The second cohort included under the umbrella term *omogeneis* consists of the so-called Greek co-ethnics, and divides in at least two major groups. One comprises the Greek-speaking (in their vast majority) Orthodox Christian minority population of Southern Albania, or *Voreioipirotes*, as they are commonly referred to in Greek, and as I will also call them in the remainder of this section. The other consists of people from the former Soviet Union, who moved there (1) from the former Ottoman Empire in the early 20th century, or (2) from Greece in the 1930s and 1940s as political (Leftist) dissidents; the latter group includes members of Greece's Slavic-speaking minority (e.g., Christopoulos 2012; Triandafyllidou and Veikou 2002). While Greek emigrants enjoy unconditional, simple, and direct access to nationality on the basis of parental descent, the rules governing the co-ethnics' access to nationality have been more complex, and have also changed following, among other things, the Greek state's geopolitical expediencies (e.g., Christopoulos 2012). *Voreioipirotes*, who came in after 1991 along with other immigrants from Albania, were not granted nationality, but a special membership status that afforded them full citizenship rights (e.g., the right to work in the public sector), but not the formal status of the national. This changed in 2006, when they were granted access to nationality through a fast-track, "priority" naturalization process on the basis of their Greek ethnic traits.

On the contrary, people from the former USSR, were granted mass access to nationality through a confirmation rather than naturalization process – yet apart from their Greek ethnic traits, members of this cohort also had to prove their Greek national

conscience. This practice flourished during the 1990s and 2000s in Greek consular offices in the former USSR, and either met with the indignation of consuls put in the position of evaluating people's national(ist) convictions or involved corrupt and obscure transactions resulting in many nationalities being revoked (Christopoulos 2012).

The topic of co-ethnics was included in the debates on the proposed law for two reasons. First, because of the bill's Article 23, which introduced more favorable conditions for the *Voreioipirotes*' access to Greek nationality. Notably, Article 23 was the bill's only clause that met with no opposition by the two parties of the Right represented in the Greek Parliament. More specifically, LAOS MP Adonis Georgiadis, stated on March 11 that his party would exempt Article 23 from its general opposition to the bill, and the leader of the center Right, Antonis Samaras, also said on February 8 that his party "of course exempts *omogeneis*" from its opposition to the proposed law. Second, because of a clause in the proposed law that made the nationality acquisition of co-ethnics conditional on a clean criminal record – thus subjecting them to the same rule as immigrants with no claims to Greek descent, and also rendering Greece's *jus sanguinis* conditional for the first time. Plevris' March 11 statement cited below encapsulates how the far Right reacted to this prospect.

"Precisely because we believe in *jus sanguinis*, we say that someone who was born to Greek parents, whom we recognize as a Greek minority, should automatically partake in Greek nationality. The *Voreioipirotis*⁵⁰, Mr. Minister, preserved Hellenism under difficult regimes, and was saying 'I am Greek.' The *Pontios*⁵¹ preserved Hellenism, and was saying 'I am Greek.' This person, then, has committed a felony. What does this mean? We do not feel him as Greek? [...]"

⁵⁰ The singular form of *Voreioipirotes*.

⁵¹ The singular form of *Pontioi*.

Plevris made his party’s adherence to unconditional *jus sanguinis* a matter of ideology. Socialist Minister Giannis Ragkousis, whose ministry had crafted the proposed law, replied in kind, stressing, as he said, a “big difference” between the governing Socialists and the party of the far Right. “We say,” Ragkousis said, “that in order for someone, subject to *jus sanguinis*, born somewhere, sometime, to Greek ancestors, to be granted Greek nationality by the Greek state today” the person must have a record clean of certain criminal offences specified in the nationality code. The far Right’s view on the other hand, Ragkousis said, is that a person “Greek by blood” must be granted Greek nationality even if convicted for serious criminal offences; even if the person “knows nothing about the Greek language or the Greek national anthem.”

Table 5-4 *Omogeneis* Have a Stronger Claim to Membership than Immigrants

Elected Officials	PASOK	Present in one parliamentary address (out of 58) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Articulated by the party’s leader in his two formal statements published in <i>Eleftherotypia</i> , and during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in almost 25 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Articulated by the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 30 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Present in one feature.
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Open Gov		Present in 18 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in six out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

Table 5-5 *Omogeneis* and Immigrants are Equally Entitled to Membership

Elected Officials	PASOK	Present in five parliamentary addresses (out of 58) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in one commentary.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in one commentary.
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Open Gov		Present in one out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Not present

Table 5-6 Immigrants Have a Stronger Claim to Membership than *Omogeneis*

Elected Officials	PASOK	Present in one parliamentary address (out of 58) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in one commentary.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Open Gov		Present in two out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Not present

III. BECOMING GREEK: THE ALTERNATIVE OF ETHNO-CULTURAL ASSIMILATION

Ragkousis' statement, which closed the previous subsection, put forward two elements that supersede descent as criteria for Greek nationality: social behavior and

familiarity with the nation's dominant cultural patterns. The latter, although articulated by Socialists such as Ragkousis, featured mostly in the argumentation of the center Right. In the paragraphs that follow, I harness their statements and argumentation to examine how the notion of ethnic assimilation was represented as an alternative to ethnic descent. In my coding scheme, such statements were placed under the conceptual label "ethno-cultural content," which exhibited variation along the properties of "adoptability" and "salience."

"We want Greece a community of letters, tradition, and culture," center-Right leader Antonis Samaras told his colleagues at the National Assembly on February 8. "A community of people who partake in our letters. This is the best antidote to racism and xenophobia."

As the remainder of his statement, cited below, indicates, Samaras built on the notion of ethno-cultural incompatibility he had articulated on the same day, and which was examined in my dissertation's previous chapter – namely, the fact that cultural plurality within a body politic impedes social order, solidarity and cohesion (particularly when plurality crosses the boundary of Europeanness). Immigrant communities turn into themselves and natives face them with suspicion.

"This is why," he continued, after warning his colleagues of this danger he predicted to Greece's social unity, "when [immigrants] come here, they must accept the rules of our society, of our way of life, of our cultural model, and not try to prevail upon it or change it," he said. "This is what we call integration, and this is how integration differs from multiculturalism. We want immigrants that choose to put down roots in our country to leave behind the elements of their own culture – but not those that are not

incompatible to our culture – to integrate into our society, to feel Greek, to become Greek through our letters.”

Besides, Samaras argued, assimilation is also the normative mode of immigrant incorporation among Greece’s European partners, i.e., countries that were faced with the question of immigrant incorporation several decades before Greece, and on whose experience Greece may draw. Britain and France, he said, turned to assimilation after the London bombings and the episodes of social unrest in the French suburbs.

The kind of assimilation that Samaras prescribed is achievable, he said, only through Greece’s national education system. To recall his party’s official position outlined in Chapter One, the center Right staunchly opposed the *jus soli* bill, which stipulated membership on the basis of birth or six years of schooling in Greece, and proposed instead membership at majority on the basis of birth and completion of all nine years of compulsory education in Greece – something which “certifies their participation in Greek letters,” Samaras said in his official memo to the government (Samaras 2010).

In Samaras’ argument, four elements stand out – the mode of incorporation he proposed, the fact that he represented it as normative, pan-European trend, the notion of “our letters” to which immigrants must partake, and the boundaries his argument stands to produce. In the paragraphs that follow, I examine the concept of “our letters,” and argue that it has two distinct, yet interrelated, meanings.

To wit, I use the term “our letters” as a translation of the Greek *paideia*. *Paideia* translates into education, and in this sense it denotes the fact that the second and one-and-a-half generation immigrants should go through the Greek educational system – a major medium of nationalist inculcation. Yet *paideia* also translates into cultivation and high

culture, and in this sense it alludes to the Greek Classical Canon, taken as the basis of the country's dominant cultural idiom as well as the basis of Western Civilization. Indeed, the origins of the phrase "partaking into Greek letters" is attributed to the ancient Athenian orator Isocrates (436/338 B.C.) and has been used historically by nationalist agents of the modern Greek state to denote the assimilatory power of "Greekness" (Tzanelli 2006). In his famous speech, *Panegyricus*, Isocrates propagated a Hellenic idea on the basis of language and culture, the latter understood as Hellenic, and especially Athenian culture. For Isocrates, language and culture distinguished humans from animals, and distinguished between uncivilized humans and civilized ones who could communicate in the language and cultural patterns that Greeks understood. As such, the Isocratic ideal was invoked in the context of the 19th century Greek, expansionary nation-building processes. As Rodanthi Tzanelli (2006) argues, the Isocratic ideal is inclusionary on the surface, but deeply ethnocentric in its assimilatory role.

Further, the argument made by Samaras and his deputies that nationality should be the last step in immigrants' process of incorporation in the host country – incorporation that for the Greek center-Right party should take the form of ethno-cultural assimilation – has been gaining ground throughout European host nations since 2000 (*inter alia* Bauböck 2006; de Hart and van Oers 2006; Ersanilli and Koopmans 2010). This view of nationality as the prerequisite and, indeed, the "reward" for integration argues that the prospect of nationality constitutes an incentive for immigrants to integrate socioeconomically, but also in terms of adopting the host country's values and identifying with its culture and history; it is also thought to protect the host country from acquiring nationals that will be an economic burden, or the cause of cultural clashes or

social discord (e.g., Bauböck 2006). The view of nationality as “reward” clashes with the reverse position, i.e., that formal membership is a matter of equal rights and opportunities rather than something that immigrants should earn, but also that nationality stimulates the incorporation of immigrants, because it strengthens their stake in the host society, and constitutes a sign of acceptance (*inter alia* Bauböck 2006; de Hart and van Oers 2006; Ersanilli and Koopmans 2010). In the next data chapter, I discuss these issues under the conceptual umbrella of citizenship. Before proceeding to the views of the people who contested the criterion of ethnic assimilation, it is important to note that, apart from Samaras and his party, this criterion was also put forward by the ruling Socialists. Below, I cite a statement made by Socialist MP Nikolaos Tsonis on March 11, during the three-day, pre-voting debate. While lauding assimilation, however, and the Greek culture’s assimilatory capacity, the Socialists did not make assimilation a prerequisite for membership – rather, they argued that it was a process already under way and which could be enhanced by granting immigrants formal nationality.

“They argue that the incorporation of immigrants will change Greek genes. From our country have passed many; Persians, Egyptians, Romans, Turks, Germans, Saracens, Venetians. Greeks and Greece remained. We are a race that civilizes, improves, and in the end conquers, assimilates any foreign element that enters us. We have no fear. We have the civilization, we have the mentality, the vigor, the nobility, the stock and the yeast that will make those who are different be jealous and want to be like us. This is our power. [...]”

Table 5-7 Ethnic Assimilation Should Be Required for Membership

Elected Officials	PASOK	Articulated by the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in almost 30 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader in his two formal statements published in <i>Eleftherotypia</i> , and during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 50 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in one commentary and one feature.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in one commentary.
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in one commentary.
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Present in one commentary and one feature.
Public Intellectuals		Present in the article of one law professor.
Open Gov		Present in three out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 25 out of 470 discussion threads in the pro- <i>jus soli</i> group.

Critiques against the notion of ethnic assimilation came primarily from the Communist and Radical Left, but also some of the ruling Socialists. The way they argued against assimilation evokes the Facebook dialogue that launched this chapter – namely, they posited that political membership should not be conditional on immigrants’ adoption of the host state’s dominant ethno-cultural content. Communist leader Aleka Papatou, for example, speaking after Samaras on February 8, addressed her criticism to him directly, and scathingly charged him with “competing” with the far Right.

“Incorporation into Greece must strip them of their own culture. We accept others’ culture to the degree that it does not go against ours,” the KKE leader said, giving her own summation of Samaras’ argument. “So the popular culture of neighboring countries of the whole world goes against the culture of Greece? So incorporation means

that he [*sic*] who is granted nationality must forget that he is Albanian, Pakistani or anything else? Are you serious?”

Further, speaking of Muslims, and particularly of their numbers, is unacceptable, Pappariga said. “We will go now to what Sarkozy does, that the Pakistani and the Indian may not wear the long shirt; they have to dress in the way we dress,” the Communist leader scorned the proximity of Samaras’ views to those of the leader of the French conservative party – a proximity that Samaras himself had readily proclaimed.

Table 5-8 Ethnic Assimilation Should not Be Required for Membership

Elected Officials	PASOK	Present in four parliamentary addresses (out of 58) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Central to the argumentation of the party’s leader during her Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in almost 60 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Present in 30 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in three commentaries.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in one commentary.
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in two commentaries.
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Present in the articles of a literary theorist, two political scientists, and one social scientist.
Open Gov		Present in 18 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill, and in eight out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 27 out of 470 discussion threads in the pro- <i>jus soli</i> group.

The point the Communist leader advances with the statement cited above leads into the third major notion discussed in this chapter – namely, the idea that people’s ethno-cultural traits or identification(s) should not determine their political membership.

The view that ethnic and national membership do not need to be isomorphic was advanced primarily by the two parties of the Left represented in the Greek parliament, but also by several deputies of the governing Socialists. This view represents the position of the third set of voices “heard” in the course of this study. Variation within this discursive camp is discussed in the next section. The conceptual thread that runs through all these alternative dimensions of collective membership consists in the idea that people develop ties as a result of their lived experiences and their participation in social units other than the ethnic. Beyond this common ground, however, notable variation exists. This discussion forms the topic of the next section.

IV. THE PRINCIPLE OF STAKEHOLDING

“These people exist, live, and toil among us,” PASOK leader and Prime Minister George Papandreou told his colleagues on February 8, referring to Greece’s long-term immigrants and their children, i.e., the proposed law’s prospective beneficiaries. “They have faces, hopes, dreams, and fears. The [debt] crisis affects them just as much, or perhaps even more [than if affects Greeks], and they worry just as much for the state to which our country has come. They work, they pay their tax and social security contributions, they prosper, they acquire property, they make families, children that they send to Greek schools, they have put down roots in Greece, the country that for many of them became the second, and for their children the only, homeland. We cannot deny them the right to participate in the social process.”

Different versions of Papandreou’s statement were uttered by most of his deputies throughout their parliamentary addresses. In my interpretation, such statements premise membership on a number of criteria. What emerges first and very strongly through

Papandreou's words is the notion of shared humanity – immigrants are people, with faces, hopes, dreams and fears. Not only this, but they are people who have linked their human emotions, worries and aspirations to those of the collective body of the Greeks, and are thus subject to the same eventualities, difficulties, and conditions. Consequently, they experience feelings of allegiance and belonging to the collective body. Further, their long-term residence in Greece translates into material moorings and contributions. Last, the second generation knows no other homeland.

For all these reasons, Papandreou argued, national membership becomes a *right*. To wit, people who participate in most areas of a country's social and economic life are entitled to the kind of formal membership that would enable them to extend this participation to all of its segments.

This notion of national membership as a right forms primarily the topic of the following chapter. Here, I wish to show how an almost identical line of argumentation was put forward to represent national membership as a *reward* – in other words, as something that the receiving society decides to grant immigrants as a reward for certain contributions. This became obvious in a statement by PASOK deputy Ioannis Diamantidis. Nationality, Diamantidis said, must be granted to immigrants “for their contribution to the development of our society and economy.” Interestingly, and as I cite below, the words he used to describe this contribution are almost identical to the words of his party's leader.

“It is our duty to recognize and honor [...] all those who contributed with their toil, along with Greek workers, to the realization of the Olympic Games, those who gathered and gather the agricultural harvest in the Greek countryside, those who took on

the care of our elderly or ailing parents and the upbringing of Greek children, those who worked alongside Greek workers and craftsmen at building sites to rebuild and develop our land, those who reinvigorated the aging villages of the Greek countryside [...],” Diamantidis told his colleagues on March 9, 2010, as he was delivering his party’s opening address.

Papandreou and Diamantidis emphasized the economic contribution of immigrants and the degree to which they have linked their fate to that of the collective unit. To end this section, I would like to cite two different lines of argument. They both fall within the broader category of ties that transcend or supersede the ethnic – ethnic descent or ethno-cultural assimilation. Each of these arguments comes from one of the two parties of the Left represented in the Greek Parliament. Both views argue for immigrant inclusion – what changes is the type of community into which immigrants are being included. For SYRIZA MP Nikos Tsoukalis, who articulated his view as a criticism of the notion of ethno-cultural assimilation, the granting of nationality ushers immigrants into a political community.

Basing membership on criteria such as the prospective nationals’ familiarity with Greek culture and history is “misleading,” said SYRIZA MP Nikos Tsoukalis on March 11, 2010. Instead, he said: “Nationality primarily consists in the relationship between the person and the state. Therefore, what is necessary is knowledge and respect of the state’s foundational constitutional principles.”

For Greece’s Communist Party, on the other hand, the grounds for membership lie in immigrants’ class position.

“For KKE, economic immigrants and refugees are a part of our country’s working class, they produce wealth, and must have equal rights and participation in social and political struggles,” said KKE MP Giorgos Mavrikos, who delivered his party’s opening statement on March 9. “For KKE, Mr. Deputies, political rights [...] are not a privilege. These rights are not a concession; they are not a privilege that immigrants must bow their head and submit in order to acquire, but a self-evident right of people who produce wealth within our country, Greece. They will not change immigrants’ class position, but they may promote their common [with Greeks] class interests, to the degree that they will correspond to these interests.”

Besides, for KKE, class constitutes a stronger and far more salient axis of collective allegiance and identification. “These distinctions on whether you are born Greek or become Greek are utterly misleading,” Mavrikos said on the same day. “Greeks do not all have the same class interests. The patriotism of the people has nothing to do with the patriotism of capital. [...] the internationalism of the working class has nothing to do with the internationalism and the cosmopolitanism of capital,” he said, evoking the same argument made by KKE leader in Chapter Four. Similarly, during her February 8 address, KKE leader Aleka Papariga spoke of a “unified class conscience, irrespective of *genus*, race, religion, or color.”

Table 5-9 Representing Stakeholding as the Primary Marker of National Membership

Elected Officials	PASOK	Articulated the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 86 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Articulated the party’s leader during her Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in over 70 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Articulated the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 70 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in six features and seven commentaries.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in five commentaries (two by the same staff columnist).
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in six commentaries (two by the same staff columnist) and in five features (two by the same staff writer).
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals	Present in the articles of seven law professors, two political scientists, one literary theorist, and one labor researcher.	
Open Gov	Present in 53 out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted in favor of the <i>jus soli</i> bill.	
Facebook	Present in 75 out of 470 discussion threads in the pro- <i>jus soli</i> group.	

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, I examined how the voices I “heard” in the course of my study conceptualized the notion of ethnic descent, which has been the main criterion of Greek national membership since the inception of the Greek nation-state. As my theoretical discussion in Chapter Two demonstrated, Greek ethnicity has historically been gauged not only on the basis of “objective” features, such as religion and language, but also, and perhaps primarily, on the willingness of the former Ottoman Empire’s Orthodox Christian subjects to adopt the dominant Greek ethnic idiom, as well as “the political

ideology of Greek ethno-racialism” (Christopoulos 2012: 72). Yet in Greece’s hegemonic national narrative, the diverse, conflict-ridden, and drawn out *processes* of people shedding other allegiances and adopting Greek ethnic features and behaviors have been collapsed and replaced by a notion of a transcendental, primordial Greekness (e.g., Karakasidou 1997). The debates I examined in this dissertation constitute the first instance when the notion of Greek ethnic descent was publicly, openly and formally *discussed*; historically, it has been normalized and shielded from critical examination. My analysis in the present chapter aimed to demonstrate how people who participated in these discussions reaffirmed, modified or contested ethnic descent both in terms of its conceptual validity as well as in terms of its salience as a marker of national boundaries. Further, I sought to examine the boundary markers and schemes that people proposed as alternative to ethnic descent. In the paragraphs that follow, I reiterate some of the main insights that emerged in the course of my analysis in the present chapter, and argue their significance to the Greek case study, as well as to the wider inquiry on the intersection of nationalism with mass immigration.

In terms of the notion of ethnic descent and the boundary-making processes it has fostered, the present chapter presented a range of views. On the one end of the discursive spectrum, people upheld the literal meaning of ethnic descent. Segments of the political far Right, as evinced both in the Parliament but particularly in online discussions strongly suspected to be dominated by far-Right ideologues, spoke of the Greek ethnic unit as a community bound together by blood. Apart from the exclusive boundaries it draws, this discourse of an ethno-biological unit also shows the power that literal notions of descent have among some Greeks.

Apart from its biological representations, however, “Greekness” was also defined as a set of cultural traits and patterns which immigrants, and particularly the second generation, should adopt as a condition of entry into the political community. Put forward primarily by the center Right in the course of parliamentary discussions, this plan limited nationality to immigrants’ children who are born in Greece and complete all nine years of compulsory education in the country. There are three major points to be reiterated here. The first relates to my study’s primary research question, which sought to examine how the reality of immigration and the prospect of national membership for immigrants affect the hegemonic notions and practices of ethnic descent. In this respect, the notion of ethnic assimilation and the boundaries it stands to produce, if seen through the historical lens I provide in Chapter Two, do not differ much – if any – from the demand that the Greek state has historically made of populations with different ethnic traits to shed these traits and embrace “Greekness” in order to be included into the national corps. In the long term, then, the center Right’s proposal, if it is put into effect and if it is successful, stands to produce the same ethnically defined body politic that the Greek state’s historical practices also had to that day. Further, seen in conjunction with the far Right’s emphasis on blood, the center Right’s assimilation scheme reveals an interesting difference within the camp of people who adhere to hegemonic notions of Greek nationalism. The difference, then, is between people who take or represent descent literally and thus implicitly deny that historically people have become Greek through complex and protracted assimilatory processes, and people who indirectly acknowledge these historical practices by wishing to reenact them at this new crossroads.

Second, and apart from its long-term ramifications, the center-Right's proposed nationality regime, in its immediate effects, includes no provisions for the one-and-a-half generation of immigrants. Further, for the second generation, it does not make it clear whether membership at majority would be automatic, or whether they would simply become eligible for naturalization, a process which could still be undermined by the Greek state's administrative practice of rejecting the membership applications of people from center ethnic, national, or religious groups (e.g., Christopoulos 2012).

Third, the argument on the basis of ethnic assimilation represents formal membership as a "reward" given to immigrants after they have integrated (more specifically, assimilated) into the host community, and corresponds to a trend that has been promoted by several center-Right parties and governments in European host nations in the past two decades, as Chapter One demonstrates.

And this is precisely the difference in terms of how the ethnic assimilation argument featured in the discourses of people against and in favor of the proposed law. As we saw, the ethnic assimilation argument was also put forward by proponents of the *jus soli* bill, i.e., the ruling Socialists, online discussants, and, to a lesser degree, journalists writing in favor of the proposed law. As I demonstrated, the way some of these voices represented "Greekness" and argued for its salience as a marker of national boundaries was eerily similar to that of the Center Right, which put forward assimilation to exclude rather than include. The difference lies in the fact that *jus soli* proponents took assimilation as something that had or eventually would happen in the case of the one-and-a-half and second-generation, and that formal membership stood to enhance this process. This inclusionary ethnocentrism has been amply analyzed by Rodanthi Tzanelli (2006),

to whose insights I have little to add. Compared to the argument that demanded *complete* assimilation *prior* to membership, one could speak of ethnocentrism in degrees. These degrees, however, make a crucial difference in terms of the life chances afforded to the children of immigrants, although the insidious and multiple social effects of assimilatory pressures and the preservation of a dominant ethnic idiom should also not be taken lightly.

Both ethnic descent and ethnic assimilation were attacked on a number of grounds, largely depending on the boundary schemes different actors wished to draw. Literal notions of descent were attacked by all the pro-*jus soli* voices I “heard” in my study, as conceptually invalid, irrelevant to formal political membership, and historical instruments of exclusion. The notion of ethnic assimilation was attacked on three distinct grounds. First, by members of the far Right, who adhered to literal notions of ethnic descent. Second, by those proponents of *jus soli* who argued that the nation constitutes a political, rather than an ethno-cultural unit. People, therefore, that have linked their fate to that of the Greek political community should have the *right* to join its ranks, without having to adopt, shed, or modify cultural patterns or behaviors. The notion of nationality as a right forms the topic of my dissertation’s final data chapter, which theorizes my research topic through the lens of citizenship, i.e., the sum of rights and duties associated to formal membership in a political community (Bauböck *et al.* 2006: 2). I now turn to these discussions.

Chapter 6: Nationality as a Matter of Citizenship

I. INTRODUCTION

“First, hospitality means that you take care of a stranger for a specific amount of time, and then he [*sic*] leaves. Second, when a stranger comes to your house, however well you may treat him, you do not make him a co-manager of your property,” wrote Thanos, yet another “guest” who visited the *pro-jus soli* Facebook group to express the opposite view. [...] ⁵² “So that I am not misunderstood,” Thanos continued farther down in the long statement he addressed to the group’s regular members on January 15, 2010, “I am against unequal treatment toward immigrants. They are (obviously) people as well. If we were a more advanced country, without most serious economic problems, perhaps we would be able to help them.” But Greece’s economy, Thanos wrote, is spiraling downward, with most of its sectors subsisting on EU funds, and with the public debt constantly rising. “Simply put,” he said, “the store will shut down in five-ten years at most. (Careful, I’m not saying this is the immigrants’ fault, but they are an extra burden.) Yet, I observe that many advocates of immigrants’ hellenization are not directly affected by them (that is, they do not lose their job or feel threatened because of rising crime), therefore think of yourselves in such a position (e.g., as an unskilled, 40-year-old unemployed person with two children, or as a mother in a neighborhood full of illegal immigrants’ shacks), and maybe you will understand some people. [...]”

“Dear Thanos,” a semi-regular group discussant, Lampros replied, “for better or for worse, immigrants have come, so the problem is in our house, and not in the yard or

⁵² Segments of the dialogue that do not pertain to the conceptual categories examined in the present chapter are omitted.

underneath the carpet. To shut our eyes and pretend we don't see them, like ostriches, is a behavior that does not befit 'proud Greeks.' [...] Our country has signed certain treaties, and, unfortunately as civilized people, we are obliged to adhere to our signatures. Therefore, concentration camps and ovens may not be built, because there will be sanctions," Lampros said. His sarcasm is indicative of the way he perceived Thanos' ideological leanings, but also of a way of framing the issue as one of dealing with fellow humans whose presence alone on Greek territory entitles them – particularly on the basis of an international regime designed to move humanity past the era of camps and ovens – to a certain amount of protection and inclusion. Besides, for as long as immigrants remain without some sort of formal status or membership, "they cause a problem for our economy, as many Greeks become rich illegally through [immigrants'] labor, and invest in state bonds and lend us at high rates. [...] And because recently I have reached my limits with the *Ellinarades* tax thieves, I have decided to believe that Greeks are those who have their taxes in order," Lampros continued, arguing that people's civic behavior and the effects of their behavior to the collective counted more to him than their ethnic traits as criteria for national membership.

Lampros' response to Thanos' comments was followed by comments by a number of the group's regular members, also trying to counter the "guest's" argument. I omit their statements, because the gist of their arguments is very close to the points Lampros raised. Following these responses, the "guest," Thanos, resumed his argumentation. Much like before, his words offered a view of the collectivity as containing a set of resources, and pondered the highly contested, as this chapter demonstrates, question of how these resources should be distributed.

“Immigrants should not have come in such large numbers. There are no jobs for everyone, and it would be better for us and them as well that they leave,” he said of Greece’s immigrant population. Unless immigrants somehow leave, “obviously the only thing that’s left to do is legalize them (it’s been proven that ovens don’t work; Hitler tried, but did not achieve much),” he said, returning Lampros’ sarcasm. Their legalization⁵³ will solve problems related to crime and tax and social security evasion, and make cheap labor available to law-abiding employers, Thanos wrote, listing the ways in which the receiving society, Greece, stood to gain from extending national membership to immigrants. The latter, on their part, will no longer live in fear, and their labor will no longer be exploited, he said. Yet all this, he continued, will have no meaning, since the pool of available resources, such as jobs, is limited, and the state is doing nothing to augment it. On the contrary, he wrote, “the state is taking a step that, while it should normally boost development, it’s turning us into a Third World country.” The combination of immigrants’ cheap labor and Greeks’ high human capital provides the condition for “explosive growth,” he said. But Greece, he said, has a huge public sector that fosters several economic inefficiencies. “What does this have to do with immigrants? Simply, we’re not ready for them, unless we solve all our economic problems. [...]”

Farther down and switching topics in response to an earlier comment made by one of his interlocutors, Thanos reasserted his belief that natives deserve priority access to the resources available within the Greek political community.

⁵³ In the course of the debates on the proposed law, people, particularly its opponents, tended to use the term “legalization” in lieu of or synonymously to nationality acquisition or naturalization.

“ALL countries in the world have borders, within which they apply their laws as it pleases their nationals, nationals use the infrastructure their state created with their taxes, use their natural resources according to the rules they themselves set, etc.” Greece, he said, is the world’s “sucker;” i.e. “the only (supposedly developed) country with open borders,” Thanos said. “Plus the fact that immigrants violate a bunch of laws, which I cannot [violate].” For example, he said, he cannot just erect some structure out of plastic on a random field and live there. Instead, he would have to take out a large mortgage and pay for it for life, or be homeless, he said, voicing the view that immigrants’ supposedly vulnerable social status makes the state more lenient toward them.

Indeed, Thanos argued farther down into his comment, immigrants enjoy preferential treatment; the argument, therefore that the host society exhibits racist or discriminatory behaviors toward them is unfair. “[...] neither do we shoot them, not do we burn them in the streets, as it happens in other countries. In no other country did so many [immigrants] gather without extreme reactions. In their majority, Greeks simply do not want them and are afraid of them. There are no extreme reactions, except for some incidents that the majority of the Greek people condemn. [...]”

At this point, another occasional group discussant, Xenophon, joined the discussion to address Thanos’ latest argument, but also call him out as a far Rightist. If Thanos were given the option of Greece contributing a sum of some million to help source countries and thus curb migration flows, would he accept it, Xenophon asked. “[O]r would you shriek that, ‘our house is on fire, and we’re saving foreigners?’” His question, he said, is “completely hypothetical.” Yet he posed it nevertheless to demonstrate that “it all comes from the racism and nationalism of some, and not from

worries about lost jobs, without this meaning that the far Right's propaganda does not resonate with a part of unemployed Greeks, who are convinced that foreign invaders are to blame for all their ills. As far as your obvious intention to downplay racist cases in Greece, [...] things are worse than you think. [...] This bill is a timid first step toward the direction of changing institutional-state racism, which is the foundation of racism in daily life." Greeks, who boast about their unique relationship with democracy, should be happy to promote it thus, he said. Or should we try "a bit of *junta*" instead, he asked, referring to Greece's infamous 1967-'74 right-wing, totalitarian regime and thus also hinting at Thanos' perceived ideological leanings.

"[I]f we had democracy, I would be happy, but we do not, and I want change," Thanos responded. Racism exists, he conceded, but "representing Greeks as Nazis is exaggerated and unacceptable." Greek state's stance "there is no more lenient" toward illegals "ANYWHERE else," Thanos wrote, before restating, at some length, his argument on Greece's limited resources and consequent inability to accommodate additions to the collective body. "The solution is that they leave and go back to where they came from (I know it's not possible)," he concluded. "It will be better for them and for us. [...]"

"You are convinced that immigrants are to blame for all ills," Xenophon retorted, as if things in Greece were better before mass immigration, in the areas of economic prosperity and social order alike. If Thanos wishes to protest the situation, why doesn't he rise up against the host of economic scandals and transgressions committed by the political establishment and banks' profiteering and only complains against immigrants instead?

“Of course I am equally upset about all these things you mention,” Thanos responded. “They [immigrants] are the cherry on the cake.” It’s all a matter of a functioning democracy and the enforcement of laws, he said, which would keep the powerful at check, as well as prevent immigrants’ undocumented entry. Since the latter has not happened, what must happen now is “a referendum on this important matter,” he said, reproducing a request formally posed by the far-Right LAOS party that the ethnopolitical body of Greeks be given the power to cast a formal vote on whether immigrants should be allowed to join their national community.

“My view is diametrically opposite to yours,” Xenophon replied, “because I believe that human rights may not be subject to referendums. Besides, these people have been here for years, and I believe that with this measure, they become subject to some sort of control and, institutionally at least, they exit a state that leads them to lawlessness with mathematical precision. [...]”

The previous chapter closed with a discussion on “the principle of stakeholding” (e.g., Bauböck *et al.* 2006: 19), i.e., the notion that, in lieu of ethnic descent, it is the ties that people develop to a country, their participation in its social, political, and economic processes, and the degree to which they link their fates to that of the collective unit that entitle them to national membership. Put differently, people in favor of national membership for immigrants sought to dispute the dominant idea of the body politic as a community of co-ethnics and instead conceptualize it as a community of *citizens*, i.e., a body of people who share a certain set of rights and responsibilities as part of their membership in a political community. This chapter examines the way proponents, but also opponents of the *jus soli* bill debated the prospect of immigrants’ formal

membership in terms of citizenship, i.e., in terms of the rights and responsibilities that national membership confers (Bauböck *et al.* 2006: 2). The overall discussion around *jus soli* sought to reaffirm or challenge the primacy of ethnic descent as a marker of national boundaries. In the course of this discussion, however, people often argued for or against national membership for immigrants from the standpoint of citizenship. The crux of these debates, particularly as it relates to my study's main research question on the primacy of ethnicity as a marker of national boundaries, consists in the following two inquiries: Does ethnic descent determine the access people should have to the rights and duties available to members of a body politic? Further, does ethnic descent also determine the *kind of citizens* people will make, i.e., the way in which they will perform their civic duties, and the allegiance they will show to the collective body?

The Facebook dialogue cited above starts with an argument that relates to the first inquiry, i.e., a view that immigrants may not have the right to manage “property” that belongs to the collective. In Thanos' view, immigrants are “guests” – in other words, people with loose moorings to the collective and therefore a limited right to manage and enjoy its resources. Put in more abstract terms, Thanos frames the issue in terms of the *availability* and the *allocation* of the resources enjoyed by members of the Greek national community. Resources such as jobs and public benefits are scarce to begin with, and the fact that immigrants take a part of them leaves even less for Greeks. Further, the allocation of resources should be ethnic-based anyway; in other words, Greeks should have privileged access to them. In their responses, *jus soli* proponents contest this view, and base immigrants' claim to collective resources, including national membership, on their presence in the country and the social ties they have developed there – besides, the

inclusion of immigrants into the national community stands to enhance collective resources. In the last exchange, between Thanos and Xenophon, there emerges the question of who has the right to decide inclusion or exclusion – are immigrants entitled to membership, or are Greeks entitled to ban them from it?

Chapter Structure

The rest of this chapter is structured thus: Section I ends with a theoretical discussion on citizenship – I conceptualize the term, differentiate it from “nationality,” provide a brief account of its genealogy in the social sciences from the post-WWII era to the present, and argue for the ways in which my discussion in the present chapter fits into and informs some of the main theoretical inquiries on citizenship currently in progress. Subsequently, I proceed to the chapter’s main discussion, which examines the conceptual categories I termed “Nationality as a Right,” and “Collective Resources” in the process of my data analysis, as well as the conversation around the demand to put the *jus soli* bill on a referendum. Viewed together and taken to a higher level of abstraction, these conversations are largely about citizenship and its relationship to formal national membership. Does immigrants’ *de facto* participation in a number of citizenship practices in Greece give them a *right* to formal membership, and thus also to (more) complete participation into the rights and duties of citizenship? Or is national membership something that the state confers as a *reward* and on the basis of its own interests? Further, does immigrants’ alleged right to membership interfere with and relate to the alleged right of natives to demarcate their political community? Moreover, is formal political membership even sufficient to provide access to the rights and duties of citizenship? These inquiries emerged from data coded under “Nationality as a Right,” and form the

topic of Section III of the present chapter. Section IV examines conversations which I classified under the conceptual category “Collective Resources,” and includes the subcategories “jobs and public benefits,” “social cohesion, order, solidarity, and allegiance,” and “democracy, justice, equality, and the rule of law.” Conceptual differentiation in each of these subcategories occurred along the properties I termed “availability,” “allocation,” and “bill’s/migration’s effect on” each of these categories of collective resources. People in favor of immigrant membership argued that their inclusion would stand to increase and enhance these collective goods, whereas people opposed to membership posited its detrimental effects. Further, people opposed to membership argued that Greeks were entitled to priority access to the resources of the political community, whereas *jus soli* proponents argued immigrants’ *de facto* membership and contribution entitled them to these resources as well.

Theoretical Foundation

Following the NATAC study (Bauböck *et al.* 2006), I draw a terminological as well as conceptual distinction between nationality and citizenship. Nationality refers to the legal bond between a person and a state, while citizenship denotes the sum of legal rights and duties that such a bond confers⁵⁴ (*inter alia* Bauböck *et al.* 2006; Marshall 1945; Turner 1990; Isin and Turner 2007). The relationship between the two is particularly salient in the socio-historical context of nationalism, within which states typically reserve the full sum of these rights and duties – in other words, full citizenship – for their nationals (e.g., Bauböck *et al.* 2006). Up until WWII, the struggle for full

⁵⁴ The NATAC Study, in turns, adheres to the distinction between the two terms drawn in public international law (Bauböck *et al.* 2006: 2). Alternately, this distinction is represented terminologically as a distinction between “formal” and “substantial” citizenship (Castles 1994 in Christopoulos 2012).

citizenship was mostly intra-national; T.H. Marshall's WWII-period seminal essay conceptualized citizenship as an expanding set of rights for an expanding set of beneficiaries, with both expansions serving to achieve the liberal-democratic ideal of equal and universal civil, political, and social rights for all members of the national community across class lines (Marshall 1945). Contemporary theorists also conceptualize citizenship as the ongoing struggle for rights by disadvantaged subjects, yet also bring to the fore structures other than class that limit access to these rights, such as gender, race and ethnicity (*inter alia* Sassen 2006; Turner and Isin 2007), and which become more salient in the light of post-WWII global transformations that contest the isomorphism between citizenship and national membership.

Theorists who examine the relationship of citizenship with the national posit that the correspondence between citizenship and national membership is challenged in the light of two major post-WWII socio-historical changes. These are intensified globalization, i.e., the increase in labor and capital mobility and the struggle over resources, and the emergence of a human rights regime, which shifts the basis of rights from nationhood to personhood, i.e., from membership in a nation to membership in the human species (*inter alia* Turner 1997; Sassen 2003; Soysal 1996). More specifically, people who come into a state as immigrants, and therefore who are members neither of the ethnic or the national group, nevertheless participate in a number of citizenship practices. This translates into a claim to the rights that citizenship entails, i.e., access to public resources, such as health, education and employment in the public sector, but also the power to participate in the decision-making mechanisms and processes that determine the fate of the collective body.

In the light of these transformations, the *problématique* on citizenship has also shifted its focus from intra-national inequalities to the growing de-articulation of citizenship from the national and its (re)articulation with other loci, features and grounds for claims. More specifically, leading theorists currently examine whether formal political membership in a state – nationality – is a necessary or even a sufficient condition for someone to participate – informally, but also formally – into the practices of citizenship (*inter alia* Brubaker 2004; Ong 2006; Soysal 1995; Sassen 2003, 2006). In my data, however, citizenship and the rights and duties it confers were represented as a *stake* in the debate for national membership. As I will demonstrate, very few voices pondered the possibility of citizenship as separate from nationality – a fact that shows that, at least in the Greek national context, rights and duties of citizenship are still very much associated to formal political membership.

II. NATIONAL MEMBERSHIP AS A *RIGHT*, AND “THE RIGHT TO HAVE RIGHTS”

Some 200,000 second-generation immigrants, born and socialized here, “fully integrated into Greek society, are called at a certain point in their lives to face this paradox,” PASOK cabinet member Theodora Tzakri told her colleagues on November 16, 2009. “They suddenly become, literally overnight, when they turn eighteen years old, a body foreign to Greek society. They turn into economic migrants, who, in order to legalize their presence in our country must either gather a certain number of social security stamps, or attend a Greek university. [...] Our class-mate, therefore, our friend, our neighbor, is treated at some point as a foreign body, is deprived of the right to a future and to a present, I would say, with the stress of insecurity depriving him [*sic*] of

the dream to plan his life [...].” Her party, Tzakri continued, believes that these people who born or raised, socialized and having their lives in Greece, have “the right to nationality, [...] since they already constitute an integral part of Greek society.”

Socialists and other proponents of the proposed law focused more, when arguing that nationality is a right, on one-and-a-half and second-generation immigrants, who could no longer be included under their parents’ documentation status when they reached majority, but were subject to immediate deportation unless they managed to secure their own documents, as Tzakri’s statement indicated. As Table 6-1 indicates, newspapers in particular ran a number of feature stories on the plight of these adolescents and young adults. Yet a similar argument was made for first-generation immigrants as well.

“Legal immigrants, despite the fact that most have lived and worked here for years, send their children to Greek schools, and pay taxes to the Greek state, live with the risk of losing their legal status and being forcefully removed. It is imperative, therefore, that we take action that secures the right of immigrants to live and work not only with the responsibilities of the Greek citizen, but with his [*sic*] rights as well,” PASOK MP Maria Michou told her colleagues on March 10.

These two statements require little interpretation. For Tzakri and others who adhered to this view, people’s *de facto* participation in many of a collective unit’s social processes entitles them to *de jure* membership as well, which renders their ties to the host nation official, secure, and permanent. In this sense, political membership was also represented by *jus soli* proponents as “the right to have rights⁵⁵” (Arendt 1951), i.e., as

⁵⁵ This phrase, which encapsulates the relationship of formal membership to citizenship and therefore features widely in the relevant literature, was coined by seminal theorist Hannah Arendt (1951), who

necessary to gain access to full civil, social, and economic rights, including, for example, the right to work in the Greek public sector, a right reserved for the country's nationals. Law professors Dimitris Christopoulos and Dimitris Dimoulis, for example, argued in an opinion piece hosted in *Avgi* on February 28, 2010 that nationality is a boundary that determines access to "basic rights;" its lack constitutes a legal distinction that reinforces existing differences and creates more. Nationals, they wrote, are privileged in terms of labor rights and social security, but also in terms of judicial protection (Dimoulis and Christopoulos 2010).

An in-depth theoretical discussion on human rights and on how they relate to citizenship rights and to formal political membership falls beyond the scope of the present work. Human rights, conceptually but also as a matter of practice – what constitutes a right and to whom it should be and has been extended, for example – are socio-historically specific and contingent (e.g., Donnelly 2013). In the debates I examine in my dissertation, proponents of membership for immigrants argued that the rights of immigrants rights would not be secure in the absence of full political membership. In this sense, full political membership as an avenue to rights also *becomes a right* precisely for this reason – more importantly, a human right that supersedes the state's authority to prevent access to nationality. Indeed, as PASOK leader George Papandreou put it during the February 8, 2010 parliamentary debate, deciding to exclude immigrants from access to political membership would consist in a "deprivation of a basic human right of a person born, raised, and living here."

argued that loss of nationality and statelessness equaled loss of all rights – citizenship rights and human rights alike.

In the Parliament, this argument was put forward by the ruling Socialists, but also by the Radical Left. SYRIZA MP Fotis Kouvelis argued on March 10 that political membership constitutes “a new right, undoubtedly, which, in my opinion, is generated by the presence and the participation in a social reality of any citizen, who claims participation into that reality.” Similarly, his fellow SYRIZA deputy Nikos Tsoukalis argued on March 11 that the “right of a person who decides to live in a country permanently to obtain nationality consists in the evolution of the political right into a civil right.”

Table 6-1 National Membership is a Right, and “a Right to Rights”

Politicians	PASOK	Articulated by the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in almost 70 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Articulated by the party’s leader during her Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in over 70 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Articulated by the party’s leader during his Feb. 8 parliamentary address. Present in 60 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in five commentaries, 16 features, and one news article.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in five commentaries (two by the same staff columnist) and in one feature.
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in ten commentaries and in five features.
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Present in the articles of two sociologists, seven law professors, a literary theorist, and a labor researcher.
Opengov		Present in 51 out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 65 out of 470 discussion threads in the pro- <i>jus soli</i> group.

Parliamentarians and others put forward this argument partly in response to a request by the far Right that nationality for immigrants should be put on a referendum. More specifically, LAOS members posited that the Greek electorate should be given the option to decide whether new members should be able to accede to their political community. Indeed, they mounted a referendum campaign that raged throughout traditional and online media. In the anti-*jus soli* Facebook group, the request for a referendum was a fixture of several conversations, and in Opengov it appeared in the majority of comments submitted against the proposed law.

In the Parliament, LAOS deputies raised the request for a referendum repeatedly. More than one-hundred thousand people have signed his party's referendum petition, said LAOS leader Giorgos Karatzaferis during his February 8 parliamentary address, asking the Prime Minister to "respect" the will of the Greek people. People who have signed his petition, Karatzaferis said, include voters of the two mainstream, center-Left and center-Right parties. "All the people are not extremist citizens; they are not all fascists, they are scientists, they are university professors, they are Greece." Indeed, Karatzaferis accused the government of fearing a referendum, because opposition to its "monstrosity" of a bill among the Greek people reached about 80 percent – something the referendum would make evident.

"Give Greeks the right to decide for themselves; give the right to a referendum," said far-Right deputy Kyriakos Velopoulos on March 11, 2010, who accused the government of a phobic attitude toward Greeks. "Do not be racist against Greeks. As far as human rights goes – because I read a lot, Mr. Kouvelis," he said, addressing his comment to the SYRIZA MP, "the plenary session of the United Nations, on December

10, 1948, says [*sic*] this regarding human rights: ‘The human right has no relation to the civil right. Rights consist in civil, political, and social.’ Based on your interpretation, do you know whose rights are violated, Ms. Minister?” he asked, rhetorically, addressing Tzakri this time. “The rights of Greek nationals are violated, who were taxed, who struggled, who bled for a free Greece to exist. Why do you not ask them what they want?”

Members of the center-Right New Democracy party similarly disputed the notion of nationality as a human right. Nationality is not a matter of human rights, but rather “about the national existence and continuity of the people who lives in this land,” said New Democracy MP Konstantinos Tzavaras on March 11.

Table 6-2 National Membership is not a Right

Politicians	PASOK	Not present
	ND	Present in 13 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Present in over 20 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in two commentaries (by the same staff columnist).
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Present in one feature.
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Opengov		Present in 36 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 18 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

The request for a referendum raged through the online submissions I examined for my dissertation – as Table 6-3 demonstrates, it was very strongly present on the wall of

the anti-*jus soli* Facebook group and among comment submitted to the government-sponsored online forum.

Table 6-3 National Membership Should Be Put to a Referendum

Politicians	PASOK	Not present
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Present in 40 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Present in one feature and one commentary.
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Opengov		Present in 169 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 34 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

But acquiring a state’s nationality and thus being able to fully participate in all aspects of its social life falls within “a necessary expanded sense of the law on human rights, and, may therefore not be subject to the will of the majority,” said PASOK MP Sofia Sakorafa during her March 9, 2010 parliamentary address. “Such a thing,” Sakorafa said, referring to the possibility of a referendum “would negate the fundamental principle of democracy itself.” Similarly, the leader of the Radical Left, Alexis Tsipras, argued on February 8 that “we cannot imagine that we will live in an era when basic rights, democratic rights will be threatened and subjected to the proviso of referendums, as if some majority, any majority may pose the question if the minority has the right to exist.”

Table 6-4 National Membership Should not Be Put to a Referendum

Politicians	PASOK	Present in 40 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Present in one parliamentary address (out of ten) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in one commentary and one feature (by the same staff writer).
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in one commentary and one news article.
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Opengov		Present in 15 out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted in favor of the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 23 out of 470 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

What stands out in the two statements cited above is not only the fact that they conceptualize membership as a right – this was also evident in the words of Papandreou and Tzakri cited in the previous section. What the statements by Sakorafa and Tsipras contribute to the conversation is the fact that they conceptualize the exclusion of immigrants as something that stands to hurt not only immigrants, but the collective body in its entirety. The effects of immigrants’ membership on the collective resources such as democracy form the topic of the present chapter next major section. Before proceeding to these discussions, however, there is one more area in terms of nationality as an avenue to rights that must be addressed. It is an argument made at once from the Left and the Right of the political spectrum – yet similarities must not obscure the fact that each side made the argument in order to argue for completely different schemes of inclusion and exclusion. People who articulated this argument disputed the salience of nationality as an

avenue to citizenship rights, pitting it against other structures of exclusion that formal political membership is not able to demolish.

Is Nationality Sufficient?

On the Left side of the political spectrum, the argument featured primarily in the discourses of public intellectuals, but was also put forward quite forcefully in the Parliament by the Communist Party, whose members, as we saw in the previous two data chapters, consistently emphasized class as decisive factors in each of the sub-topics related to nationality.

Nationality is not a “panacea,” Communist leader Aleka Pappariga told her colleagues during her February 8 parliamentary address, because it does not do away either with nationalist views and practices, and their socially detrimental effects, or with labor-related abuses, such as low wages. The point is, Pappariga said, “in what society you live, and how it recognizes the toil of people who, for whatever reason, came to live in a new homeland.” Political membership does not negate class exploitation, which the state fosters in various reasons through the complicity of powerful state agents with powerful business interests, Pappariga argued.

This point was raised repeatedly by Facebook proponents of the proposed law – particularly people who, much like the two parties of the Left in the Parliament, backed the Socialists’ bill, but pointed out the class inequalities that nationality did not alleviate. On January 9, for example, an infrequent discussant, Anna, disputed the impact that nationality stood to make: “We’re talking about nationalities in an era when the only thing that matters is the per capita income,” she wrote, arguing that formal political, i.e., electoral, rights provide little, if any, actual political participation. On Facebook,

however, most such discussions ended with the bill's proponents conceding the point, but still underscoring the importance of granting nationality.

"I think you underestimate the importance of institutions in matters of equal treatment by the law, but also in how they influence mentalities," replied Aris, one of the *pro-jus soli* group's most frequent contributors. "Exclusions and inequalities exist because of many other things AS WELL, [national] origin being one of them." Or, as Aris put it in the course of a similar discussion on January 8: "Mentalities and 'invisible' borders change with great difficulty. What matters is that we protect people institutionally."

Similar arguments were put forward by public intellectuals who expressed their views in opinion pieces. In his August 2 piece published in *Kathimerini*, for example, Miltos Pavlou argued that, in order to truly expand the boundaries of Greek citizenship [*idiotita tou polita*], laws that grant formal membership are not enough to do away with practices such as racial profiling or social exclusion (Pavlou 2009c).

On the other end of the ideological spectrum, the bill's opponents also argued the inefficiency of nationality to effect equal citizenship. In the Parliament, it was put forward by the center and the far Right alike.

How does nationality contribute to job security, healthcare, education, or pension benefits, center-Right deputy Christos Zois asked his colleagues on March 11. "Pray, explain," Zois addressed his colleagues of the governing party. "In what does Greece lag behind other European countries in these matters? Tell me; answer me! [...] Greece has a nationality code since 2004, which stipulates that one may obtain the right to apply for naturalization and acquire nationality – under conditions, of course." The *jus soli* bill,

therefore, brings nothing new, Zois argued. Long-term documented residents have rights that “want for nothing” compared to rights of Greek nationals. “Of course, they may not vote. Of course, they do not serve in the army. Of course, they may not work in the public sector. But, so that I understand what this [bill] is, will you secure a job for them as well by giving them nationality after five years [of residence]? Will you secure better healthcare for them? Education? Pension benefits?” The proposed law, Zois argued, does not contain a single clause dealing with immigrants’ “social integration.”

Similarly, an online discussant commenting on Opengov put it thus:

“It’s one thing for immigrants to have a good life, to participate normally in economic and social life, to have basic labor and social security rights, and another thing for them to become a part of the Greek people and the Greek nation. Because this is what nationality means. [...] We’re not talking about social rights and equal participation in economic and social life. We’re talking about participation in political life. They are different things. Let us not conflate them.”

Apart from arguing that nationality is not sufficient, then, people against the *jus soli* bill they also asserted the view that immigrants are not entitled to certain of the provisions of formal membership – the center-Right deputy spoke of access to work in the public sector, whereas the online comment made it about political decision-making power – areas of citizenship rights and duties to which formal membership entitles. In Section III that follows and examines data coded under the conceptual category “Collective Resources,” I examine each such area separately. Before proceeding to these discussions, I provide a table that contextualizes the views expressed in the present subsection.

Table 6-5 Disputing Nationality as an Avenue to Rights

		Argument: Formal membership does not do away with all structures of exclusion, but should still be granted.	Argument: Formal membership does not do away with all structures of exclusion, and thus should not be granted.
Elected Officials	PASOK	Not present	Not present
	ND	Not present	Present in three parliamentary addresses (out of 46) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Articulated by the party's leader during her Feb. 8 parliamentary address.	Not present
	LAOS	Not present	Present in one parliamentary address (out of 33) in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present	Not present
Public Intellectuals	Articulated by a labor researcher and a migration specialist.	Not present	
Open Gov	Present in 23 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.	Not present	
Facebook	Present in 13 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.	Present in five out of 470 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.	

III. IMMIGRANT MEMBERSHIP AND ITS EFFECT ON COLLECTIVE GOODS

Democracy, Justice, Equality, and the Rule of Law

“In the last decade,” SYRIZA deputy Nikos Tsoukalis told his colleagues on March 9, 2010, “Greece has amassed a major democratic deficit. Hundreds of thousands

of people are subject to Greek laws, and yet were never given the possibility to affect with their will the legislative process.” These people, Tsoukalis said, are “people without an identity; people without a say.” The *jus soli* legislative initiative, he said, is fulfilling “the democratic imperative of harmonizing the Greek political community with this country’s population. Further, in the course of the same address, Tsoukalis pointed out the problem of a divided body politic; denying political membership “to people who have sought and achieved social integration” consists in “collective rejection; [and in] and confining large segments of the population to a subordinate position.”

The proposed law, its proponents argued, also stands to enhance democracy in Greece not only because it puts an end to institutionalized political exclusion, but also because of another novelty: because for the first time, it makes the Greek state and its administrative mechanisms accountable for their decisions to grant or deny national membership.

With this law, Papandreou said during his February 8 parliamentary address, his party “put[s] an end to the lack of transparency – because there was complete lack of transparency – and to the full absence of accountability that reigns with our country’s current nationality regime.” According to Papandreou, the proposed law stood to establish “objective and controllable procedures” that break with the previous regime of naturalizations happening in an arbitrary, and often clientelist, ways, Papandreou said, pointing the finger at the conservatives that had ruled for five years prior to the Socialists’ 2009 reelection. “What we finally ask for in this country is the reinforcement of the rule of law, so that no political rulers, powerful agents, friends or chums may decide arbitrarily.”

Indeed, up to the March 2010 passage of the bill examined in my dissertation, the Greek state was not obligated to respond to applications for naturalization within a specific time frame – therefore, in this sense, not obligated to respond at all – and neither was it obligated to substantiate negative decisions (Christopoulos 2012). Putting an end to this legal and administrative regime that Dimitris Christopoulos conceptualizes as a state of exception “in the classic Schmidtian sense” (Christopoulos 2012: 231), the proposed law instituted both a specific time frame for the state to process and decide on applications for nationality, but also an obligation for the state to substantiate negative decisions.

The proposed law, therefore, does not render the nation’s boundaries “lax,” or the acquisition of nationality “automatic,” said Socialist cabinet member Ioannis Ragkousis on March 11, responding also to the charge leveled against the proposed law, discussed in Chapter Four of this work, that it stood to offer practically unrestricted entry into the national community. Rather, Ragkousis said, the proposed law “restores [...] the rule of law, [...] a transparent process, which can guarantee in Greece conditions of social harmony [...],” rather than a Greece with a marginalized, hope-deprived social body in its midst.

The accountability it institutes is one of the key features that compel his party to support the bill, even in its watered-down version that leaves out the children of undocumented parents, SYRIZA MP Thodoris Dritsas argued on March 9. Procedures that are “rational,” “progressive,” and “humanitarian” are necessary, lest Greece becomes a “purgatory” and a “slaughter house,” he said, alluding to the effects that an arbitrary legal regime stands to have on the society’s “psyche” as a whole.

Table 6-6 Nationality Enhances Democracy, Equality, Justice and the Rule of Law

Politicians	PASOK	Present in almost 65 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present.
	KKE	Not present.
	LAOS	Not present.
	SYRIZA	Present in 40 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in twelve features and eleven commentaries.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in one feature and five commentaries (two by the same staff columnist).
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in seven features and eight commentaries (three by the same staff columnist).
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Present in the articles of four law professors.
Opengov		Present in 13 out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 27 out of 470 discussion threads in the pro- <i>jus soli</i> group.

Jus soli opponents, on the other hand, argued that the government undermines democracy by depriving Greeks of the possibility to define their nation through a national referendum. Articulated by one LAOS deputy in the National Assembly, this argument was particularly prevalent in online discourses against the proposed law, and were associated to the far Right’s request for a referendum. Below, I cite a representative segment from the government-sponsored online forum.

“If you believe even a little in transparency, as you say, in participatory democracy, or, in any case, in DEMOCRACY, which was born and took roots in Greece as a concept and as essence, you have the duty to ask the opinion of the Greek people, who voted for you to become the prime minister of Greece, not of a country-Benetton. REFERENDUM NOW.”

Table 6-7 Nationality Hurts Democracy, Equality, Justice and the Rule of Law

Politicians	PASOK	Present in almost 65 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present.
	KKE	Not present.
	LAOS	Not present.
	SYRIZA	Present in 40 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Not present
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Opengov		Present in 76 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 15 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

Employment and Public Spending

Apart from democracy, people negotiated the effects of the prospect of immigrant membership on the state's material resources, i.e. employment, public benefits, education, and healthcare. A comment derived from the body of online submissions to the government-sponsored public forum summarizes the view of people opposed to the *jus soli* legislative proposal:

“It is not to our national interest to grant nationality to foreigners who were born here, etc. On the contrary, it makes us angry that strangers will become equal to us. Nobody asked us, when foreigners came to Greece. We gave them healthcare and work, and the result was that foreigners had work and Greeks did not (most of the time). We offered them education for their children and social protection [...]. They shouldn't demand anything more.”

In my interpretation, two points stand out in this statement. First, the fact that immigrants are not entitled either to rights or to duties that come with membership in Greece's political community. Second, that whatever rights and duties they have been

able to access through the rightful owners’ charity should suffice. Indeed, they should not ask for more – that would come to them via political membership – particularly given the fact that they take collective goods, such as employment, from Greeks. The opposite viewpoint is cited below the table that contextualizes the anti-*jus soli* argument.

Table 6-8 Nationality Hurts Resources such as Jobs and Public Benefits

Politicians	PASOK	Not present.
	ND	Present in almost 30 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Not present.
	LAOS	Present in 45 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Not present
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in two commentaries.
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Present in two features and one commentary.
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Opengov		Present in 65 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 32 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

“I heard that, if we give them nationality, we’ll have to shoulder them,” Papandreou said during his February 8, 2010 parliamentary address, referring to statements to that effect made by the two parties of the Right opposed to the *jus soli* legislative provision. “Right now, they’re the ones shouldering a significant part of Greece’s economy.” If immigrants regularize their status in Greece by acquiring nationality, they will be able to “pay into pension funds, [...] they pay their taxes, [...] they serve their military duty.” In short, the inclusion of immigrants will benefit society as a whole and augment its pool of material resources.

Table 6-9 Nationality Enhances Resources such as Jobs and Public Benefits

Politicians	PASOK	Present in 40 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Not present
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in four features and three commentaries.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in three features and two commentaries.
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in two features, two commentaries, and one news article.
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present
Public Intellectuals		Present in the article of two sociologists and a law professor.
Opengov		Present in 23 out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted in favor of the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 37 out of 470 discussion threads in the <i>pro-jus soli</i> group.

Social Cohesion, Order, Solidarity, and Allegiance

Apart from material resources, voices I “heard” in the course of this study debated the effect of immigrant membership on social order and cohesion. *Jus soli* opponents argued their position on this issue on two grounds, as the discursive segments cited below evince.

Fifty-five percent of people currently incarcerated in Greece are immigrants, LAOS leader Giorgos Karatzaferis said during his February 8, 2010 parliamentary address. Since immigration started, he said, crime has increased, and are immigrants responsible for most of it. “The majority of criminals are immigrants,” Karatzaferis told his colleagues at the National Assembly. “Not all immigrants are criminals, but the majority of crooks who are in prison are immigrants. Let us make this clear. This is reality.”

Apart from immigration’s effect on social order, *jus soli* opponents also posited its detrimental effect on social cohesion. In the midst of Greece’s worst economic crisis, the “mass” granting of nationality risks causing “great social unrest,” center-Right leader Antonis Samaras told the National Assembly at the same day. “It is in such conditions that xenophobia peaks in societies,” Samaras said. The proposed law “triggers” it instead of “diffusing” it.

Table 6-10 Nationality Hurts Social Cohesion, Order, and Solidarity

Politicians	PASOK	Not present
	ND	Present in almost 30 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	KKE	Not present
	LAOS	Present in over 40 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Not present
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Not present
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in two commentaries.
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in two commentaries (by the same staff columnist).
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Present in one feature.
Public Intellectuals		Not present
Opengov		Present in 65 out of the 340 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 32 out of 146 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

However, it is not immigrants, but lack of plan that causes “social problems, phobias, lawlessness, crime, social unrest,” as well as “conflict and polarization,” Papandreou retorted, also during his February 8 parliamentary debate.

Table 6-11 Nationality Enhances Social Cohesion, Order, and Solidarity

Politicians	PASOK	Present in 80 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	ND	Not present.
	KKE	Not present.
	LAOS	Present in over 40 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
	SYRIZA	Present in 30 percent of its MPs addresses in the three-day, pre-voting debate.
Newspapers	<i>Eleftherotypia</i>	Present in five features and three commentaries.
	<i>To Vima</i>	Present in three features and four commentaries (two by the same staff writer).
	<i>I Kathimerini</i>	Present in two features and two commentaries.
	<i>Proto Thema</i>	Not present.
Public Intellectuals		Present in the articles of two sociologists, three law professors and a labor researcher.
Opengov		Present in 14 out of the 98 comments examined that were submitted against the <i>jus soli</i> bill.
Facebook		Present in 33 out of 470 discussion threads in the anti- <i>jus soli</i> group.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The present chapter examined conversations that framed national membership through the lens of citizenship, i.e., through the question of access to the rights and responsibilities that formal membership in a state affords. The socio-historically contingent relationship between nationality and citizenship (e.g., Sassen 2003) consists in currently very vigorous *problématique* in the social sciences, as I demonstrated in my theoretical discussion. In their overwhelming majority, conversations that were central in my data and therefore determined the present chapter's discussion negotiated the relationship between ethnic descent and citizenship, and represented citizenship as a stake in the debate on access to formal membership. In other words, the main questions pondered were (1) whether ethnic descent should bestow people with privileged access to

the rights and duties of citizenship, and (2) whether ethnic descent makes people better citizens.

The present chapter's key finding consists in the fact that *jus soli* proponents represented political membership as a *right* that immigrants have on the basis of their *de facto* participation in citizenship practices. This breaks considerably with nationalist norms of membership, which hold that the sovereign state has absolute discretion in determining schemes of inclusion and exclusion. Second, the fact that immigrant inclusion was heralded as beneficial to the collective unit as a whole and, more specifically, as something that would enhance democracy and social cohesion but also bring about economic benefits. Rather than – or perhaps apart from – an instrumental view of immigrant inclusion, I posit that this argument reveals a conception of Greeks and immigrants as forming one, unified group with common problems and interests. The opposite view is that Greeks and immigrants constitute (at least) two distinct social bodies set apart by ethnicity, which determines not only people's claims to collective resources, but also their social behavior.

Chapter 7: Conclusions

I. INTRODUCTION

If there is one thing that all the people “heard” in the course of my study have in common, it is their desire to argue and, if possible impose, their preferred schemes of inclusion and exclusion for Greece. This, in itself, poses no surprise; as I argue in Chapter One of my dissertation, collective boundaries are never fixed or uncontested, but rather are constantly (re)defined on the basis of people’s diverse beliefs and interests (e.g., Gieryn 1983; Massey 2007). Greeks whose views I examined in my dissertation, then, proposed and advocated for vastly different national boundaries – a fact that confirms that, faced with mass immigration, natives (re)define national boundaries in a variety of ways.

To recap, voices I “heard” in the course of my study were found to correspond to three main conceptual camps depending on whether and how they reaffirmed or challenged key tenets of the nationalist ideology. The first was the nationalist camp; i.e., those people who premised collective belonging on hegemonic definitions of what it means to be Greek. Variation within this camp was exhibited mostly in the way people conceptualized (Greek) ethnic membership as literally blood-based and therefore impossible to acquire, or as the complete adoption of a set of ethnic and cultural patterns. Voices in the second camp sought to tweak nationalist norms enough to effect the inclusion into the national body of second-generation immigrants born or one-and-a-half generation immigrants socialized in Greece; their discourses reproduced a nationalist worldview, yet also yielded much more inclusive boundaries. The third camp consisted of people who sought to divorce political belonging from ethnicity altogether, and also

fundamentally contested a number of nationalist norms, including, for example, the authority of states to characterize migration as “illegal,” or ban immigrants from national membership disregarding their ties to the host country, and their *de facto* participation in a number of the political unit’s social and economic processes.

In the present chapter, which concludes my dissertation, I demonstrate how my findings inform scholarship on nationalism in general and Greek nationalism in particular, how they fit into anthropological accounts of culture and ethnicity, and what they say about the role of mass immigration in (re)defining norms of national belonging in the contemporary socio-historical context. I begin by recapitulating my study’s research problem, and by summarizing the theories that informed my investigation. Next, I demonstrate how the insights gained through my research inform these theories. In closing, I discuss directions for future research.

II. RESEARCH PROBLEM AND QUESTIONS

On a broad, theoretical level, my study set out to examine nationalism, which I defined as the socio-historically embedded ideology that prescribes that the ethnic and the political units must coincide (Gellner 1983; Hobsbawm 1990). The three key theorists of nationalism I examined argue that nationalism and the nation-state emerge at a particular point in human history and in response to specific socio-historical conditions. Eric Hobsbawm (1990) ties the nation to the modern state, and argues that the nation organizes social interaction only as long as the modern state constitutes the primary unit of economic development. Further, he attributes nationalism to people’s struggles over power, status and resources that compel them to acquire the state’s dominant ethno-cultural idiom. Ernest Gellner (1983) attributes nationalism and nations to the industrial

era's need for communication in a shared linguistic and cultural idiom. For Benedict Anderson (1983), the nation and nationalism consist in systems of cultural representation that arise from the ways in which modern technologies of information and communication as well as administrative mechanisms create meaning.

My critical examination of these three scholars' writings yielded two research questions. First, if nationalism emerges within a specific socio-historical context, how does it fare when certain socio-historical conditions change? More specifically, how does it fare in circumstances of mass cross-border mobility and inter-ethnic contact that *de facto* contest the normativity of rooted, ethno-homogeneous belonging (e.g., Trouillot 2003)?

Second, among the three theorists, Gellner and Anderson assert the fact that people embrace nationalism and that national identification supersedes other axes and loci of collective belonging, but do not problematize the spread or potency of nationalist inculcation. Hobsbawm, on the other hand, questions whether the nationalist ideology ever extends to the entire population of a nation-state and also whether national sentiment trumps other forms of identification and allegiance. Following Hobsbawm's argument, I sought to examine whether the voices I "heard" in the course of my research diverge from nationalist norms and conceptions.

Anthropological accounts of culture and ethnicity formed my primary analytical lens, but also helped me understand the processes of nationalist inculcation, as nationalist views, mechanisms, and practices superimposed themselves on previous norms of collective belonging. Fredrick Barth's *Ethnic Group and Boundaries* (1969) established that ethnicity is socially constituted and consists in interaction, i.e., in the process of

making, maintaining, re-negotiating and crossing group boundaries. According to Barth, ethnic boundaries form and re-form in response to socio-historical conditions, not as a function of the cultural content they enclose. In Barth's view, cultural patterns do not cause group formation, but are deployed strategically by particular social actors to accentuate real and perceived similarity and difference across groups of people (Barth 1969; Jenkins 2008). Barth's understanding of processes of group formation and re-formation along with more recent theoretical advances on his model (*inter alia* Gieryn 1983; Lamont and Molnár 2002) formed my study's analytical lens. More specifically, the different arguments for or against the inclusion of immigrants that I "heard" in the course of my research were conceptualized as instances of "boundary work" (Gieryn 1983: 781), i.e., as discursive schemes that put selective emphasis on different axes of commonality or difference (e.g., ethnic features versus social ties) in order to demarcate the nation in different ways.

Yet, while it explains how processes of ethnic differentiation operate, Barth's model does not situate these processes socio-historically (Verdery 1993). Anthropologists Brackette Williams (1989) and Katherine Verdery (1993), in contrast, implicate the modern nation-state as a primary vehicle for the production of ethnic sameness and difference. Myths of ethno-cultural homogeneity are crucial to the production of the kind of subjectivities necessary to the modern state's administrative tasks. The production of sameness, however, implies the simultaneous production of difference. Difference that previously did not define groups or organize social interaction with nationalism becomes socially significant. It serves to demarcate the group that becomes metonymic for the nation-state from the marked ethnic categories with weaker claims to the polity's material

and symbolic resources. Yet other scholars from the fields of Anthropology or Cultural Studies argue that nationalist inculcation is never complete; strenuous efforts to incorporate and normalize diverse elements have failed to erase existing difference or completely quash alternative narratives of community (Bhabha 1990; Chatterjee 1993). These cracks in nationalism's supposedly solid structure threaten to widen when immigrants arrive en masse and re-pluralize the painstakingly homogenized national terrain (*inter alia* Appadurai 2003; Bhabha 1999; Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Trouillot 2003).

Indeed, in the past several decades, enormous scholarly effort has addressed the varied sociocultural reconfigurations that occur as a result of immigration. Yet most migration scholarship from the Chicago School to the present focuses not on the receiving country's identification(s), but on immigrants' identificational processes given the new context and transnational interaction with their homeland (*inter alia* Alba and Nee 1997; Glick-Schiller *et al.* 1992, 1995; Portes and Zhou 1993). The question of how immigration prompts natives to (re)define national imaginaries in reaction to the pluralization of their familiar environment has not been examined nearly as much. To begin examining this question, I drew on the work of Anna Triandafyllidou (2001), which takes as its central task to theorize the effects of immigration on the host nation's self-understanding(s). More specifically, Triandafyllidou argues that nations define and redefine themselves in response to "Significant Others" (2001: 32), i.e., groups geographically or culturally close to the nation, who come to share a "*close relationship with the [ingroup's] sense of identity and uniqueness*" (2001: 33, emphasis in the original) and at the same time "*represent what the ingroup is not*" (2001: 32, emphasis in

the original). Immigrants assume the role of a Significant Other, when any of their features (language, religion, phenotype, etc.) are seen as threatening to the nation's (perceived) cultural purity. In response, Triandafyllidou concludes, the nation adopts a more exclusive self-definition and erects strong walls against unwanted newcomers.

Yet, apart from the processes of symbolic closure that Triandafyllidou explicates, research is needed to examine the plurality of national re-conceptualizations that the presence of immigrants triggers among different segments of the host community – particularly, if, as Hobsbawm (1990) argues, not everyone embraces nationalist norms of collective belonging. Triandafyllidou herself stresses that her model applies to a nationalist world, where hegemonic norms prescribe political and ethno-cultural correspondence (2001: ix). It does not predict the reactions of people who may have never embraced this norm, people “who are not necessarily national or still less nationalist” (Hobsbawm 1990: 10) – or people who *reconsider* the nationalist model in response to the growing pluralization of their familiar environment (Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Trouillot 2003).

To examine the theoretical questions described above, I used my home country, Greece, as a case study. Historically, the Greek nation-state has engaged in a series of purification campaigns to either exclude or forcefully assimilate populations that did not conform to its dominant ethno-cultural idiom. National membership was premised upon Greek ethnic descent; in Chapter Two, I explicate that this nebulous attribute was largely substantiated by religion, which constituted the main administrative distinction within the Greeks' former political unit, the Ottoman Empire, language as well as the “political

ideology of Greek ethno-racialism” (Christopoulos 2012: 72), i.e., the belief in the primordial character of the Greek ethno-national unit.

A country that consistently swept ethnic plurality under the carpet, Greece did not face the pluralization that results from mass immigration until the collapse of the Communist Bloc. The 1991 population census registered the foreign born at just over one percent of the population total (Kasimis and Kassimi 2004); by the time of the events examined in my study, their percentage had climbed to 11.3 (Triandafyllidou and Maroukis 2010). More than 70 percent of immigrants were of Albanian origin; other source countries included Bulgaria, Romania, former Soviet Republics and developing countries in Asia and Africa (Triandafyllidou and Maroukis 2010). For the largest part of these two decades, this new sociocultural reality was addressed with piecemeal legislation, such as entry restrictions or regularization programs (Triandafyllidou 2009). In November 2009, however, faced with a second generation reaching majority, the country’s Socialist government proposed a law that would extend nationality to children of immigrants born or schooled in Greece. The bill represented an unprecedented challenge to the primacy of ethnic descent as the legal and sociocultural norm of collective belonging – not least because it marked the first-time Greeks discussed, formally and publicly, the prospect of institutionally acknowledging ethnic plurality as an element of the nation. As such, the proposed law spurred fierce debates on the boundaries and character of the Greek national community, and presented a valuable opportunity for the researcher to (1) capture how a host nation reconfigures its self-understandings in response to the novel prospect of new, immigrant members, and (2) observe a first-time, mass challenged to a strongly hegemonic ideological norm. Data for my study consisted

of reactions on the proposed *jus soli* legislation that were articulated in the Greek Parliament, mainstream newspapers, Facebook, and a government-sponsored online forum.

In the next section, I explicate my study's findings and its contributions to scholarship on nationalism, ethnicity, and the Greek ethno-national context. That section is structured much like an inverted pyramid – I begin with the specifics of my case study and gradually transition to how my research contributes to the broad theoretical field of nationalism. To wit, I begin by explaining the findings that add to scholarship on the particular case of Greek nationalism. Subsequently, I discuss the way in which the Greek case contributes to scholarship on nationalism and processes of collective identification. Following the specifics of the Greek case, I discuss my findings that enrich scholarly knowledge of the boundary-making processes in which nationals engage when faced with the prospect of new members that do not fit the dominant ethno-cultural idiom. Do nationals make a collective turn inward, and emphasize those elements of their shared, ethno-national identification that show how irreconcilably different they are from their political community's prospective new members? Or is this *just one among several* responses to the prospect of the nation's ethnic pluralization? Answers to these questions also inform the discussion of how my study contributes to scholarship on nationalism.

III. FINDINGS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

The Greek National Context

The most significant finding that advances the understanding of Greek processes of collective identification consists in the ways in which Greeks discussed the notion of ethnic descent, both in terms of its conceptual validity, as well as in terms of its salience

as a marker of collective boundaries. These discussions revealed both the conceptual grasp that the slippery notion of descent has on Greeks, as well as the ways in which it is reaffirmed, modified or contested in order to (re)define the nation's boundaries and character. Members of the far Right represented in the Parliament, as well as online discussants strongly suspected of belonging to the far-Right ideological camp argued that the Greek nation constitutes an ethno-biological community, and should continue to do so. Within the same political camp, descent was stripped of its biological connotations, and represented as the belief in ethno-biological commonality that extends so far in the ethnic unit's pre-national past that its veracity does not make a difference. While important conceptually, this divergence does not make a difference in matter of exclusion or inclusion; membership is still limited to people who are born to Greek parents – in other words, it excludes all immigrants from national membership.

Moving from exclusive toward the inclusive end of the discursive spectrum, a notion put forward primarily by the political center Right in the National Assembly and to a lesser degree by journalists and online discussants was the notion of complete ethnic assimilation as a prerequisite for national membership. As I argued in the “Conclusions” to Chapter Five of my dissertation, this is significant in a number of ways. First, it reproduces in the Greek context an argument that has gained increasing ground in European host nations in the past two decades – to wit, that nationality should be conditional on immigrants adopting the host country's ethnic idiom and should only be granted after such adoption is complete. Second, in terms of its import to the Greek context, I argued that the center Right's boundary scheme stood to reproduce, in the long term, the same ethnically defined body politic as the norm of ethnic descent has

historically produced in Greece. Seen together, the divergence between literal notions of descent and the “alternative” of ethnic assimilation represents a difference between people who take descent literally and do not acknowledge Greece’s history of complex and protracted assimilatory processes, and people who indirectly acknowledge these historical practices by wishing to reenact them at this new crossroads.

On the other hand, people who disputed both the validity and the salience of ethnic descent focused on the concept’s historical operation as an instrument of exclusion. This is significant, because it demonstrates an effort to remove the concept from its normative trappings, examine the boundaries it has served to draw, and ponder whether it should be allowed to continue demarcating the nation in the same way.

Apart from conversations on the notion of ethnic descent, people whose voices I “heard” in the course of my study engaged in debate on the phenomena of cross-border mobility and ethno-cultural mixture – notions and patterns that constitute the building blocks of nationalist views and practices, as I argue in Chapter Four of my dissertation. What stood out in these discussions is the conceptualization of cross-border mobility as a *right* that supersedes the authority of states to regulate it. The same notion of national membership as a *right* emerged in the discussions I examined in Chapter Six, on the basis of immigrants’ *de facto* participation in Greek social life that overrides the legal authority of states or the (presumed) moral authority of the nation’s dominant ethnic group to determine who may or may not join the national community.

Finally, what stood out throughout my data chapters was the fact that conceptual differentiation mapped neatly onto Greece’s political-ideological lines. In other words, views became less and less nationalist from the Right to the Left end of the political

spectrum. This held true not only in the Parliament, but also in newspapers I examined for study – chosen, as Chapter Three explains, to span the political-ideological spectrum – and in online discussions, to the degree that I was able to gauge the discussants’ offline political and ideological leanings. As a finding, this falls into line with literature I presented in my dissertation’s introductory chapter, and which has found that that nationality legislation “fundamentally divides” (Akkerman 2012: 516) left and right-wing parties. My study fleshes out this finding, by demonstrating the continuum from more to less nationalist views along the political-ideological spectrum; to reiterate, the far and center Right differed on whether they took descent literally, but otherwise both premised belonging on ethnicity, the Social Democrats tweaked nationalist norms enough to include immigrants, but did not fundamentally contest the nationalist worldview, whereas Greece’s two left-wing parties represented in the Parliament sought to break with nationalist norms altogether.

But what does the study of Greece contribute to the broader question of how mass immigration challenges the hegemony of nationalist norms of collectivity? What does it tell us regarding the way nations (re)define their self-understandings in response to mass immigration?

National Identities and the “Other”

The title to this subsection is borrowed from the homonymous study (Triandafyllidou 2001) that formed one my dissertation’s theoretical launching platforms. To recap, Triandafyllidou argued that, when faced with prospective new members seen as threatening to the nation’s (perceived) purity, nationals make a collective turn inward, and emphasize their nation’s distinctiveness in a way that excludes the newcomers. Put

differently, they emphasize those ethnic or cultural features that set their nation apart from the newcomers. Triandafyllidou's argument, then, holds true for those Greeks who adhered to a nationalist view of the world, and therefore conceptualized immigrant membership as an aberration that threatens the normative categorization of the world between natives and foreigners. Faced with immigrants pushing at their nation's boundaries, these Greeks emphasized those elements of the nation's identity that set it apart from the newcomers. Racial, cultural and religious features were emphasized to accentuate the unbridgeable difference between Greeks and their prospective compatriots.

Other Greeks however put emphasis on different elements of collective identification in order to assert commonality rather than difference between the Greek nation and immigrants. They spoke of the social ties that people develop, because they live, work and "play" next to and with each other, irrespective of ethnic traits. They spoke of common experiences within the same political unit that shape the way people think, act, and identify with each other more than ethnic or cultural features do. They spoke of the willingness to co-exist within the same social body and the contribution of immigrants to the nation's collective well-being.

In conclusion, then, and to build on Triandafyllidou's argument, when immigrants are perceived as "Significant Others" (2001:32), the reaction is indeed a more restrictive national understanding. But not all segments of the nation see immigrants as Significant Others, because not all segments of the host community hold a nationalist worldview. Apart from this, the reality of immigration and the new social processes and relations it generates compels some natives to modify nationalist views in order to include

immigrants in the national community while maintaining the latter's ethno-cultural character, as is the case with the second set of voices I "heard" in the course of this study.

Nationalism

My study's overall contribution to the theoretical field of nationalism should be seen within several contexts. First, the comparative European context I set out in the introductory chapter of my dissertation. To reiterate, the brief account I gave of how immigration has affected the national narratives and nationality regimes of several European host nations demonstrates that most of the discourses that emerged in the Greek debate examined in my dissertation are not novel; rather they have played out in different forms in one or more European countries. In view of this, I am compelled to look at the conditions that fostered the conceptual divergence evinced in the course of my study. As I demonstrated, the *jus soli* debate took place in Greece at a historical moment when voices across the political and ideological spectrum enjoyed comparable degrees of legitimacy and the ability to speak and to be heard publicly. Further, conversations that sought to chip at or altogether rupture the hegemony of ethnic descent followed a series of conversations and practices that had taken place in the country in the past two decades also seeking to modify or contest nationalist ideas and practices – indicatively, I mentioned the abolition of Article 19 of the Greek Nationality Code, which put a halt to the Greek state's decades-long practice of arbitrarily taking away nationality from members of Greece's Muslim minority (Anagnostou 2005). In this climate, the reality of a growing body of *de facto* citizens who nevertheless were deprived of many of the rights and protections that formal membership confers, along perhaps with the reality of *jus sanguinis* losing ground or at least having to co-exist with different forms of *jus soli*

throughout Greece's EU partner nations, pushed, or perhaps gave an additional incentive to some Greeks to break with the hegemony of ethnic descent and make nationality available to people with no claims to Greek ethnic membership. Seen within all these contexts, a conclusion that emerges is that, given the right circumstances, some people can think beyond ethnicity as fundamental to the nation and indeed articulate and push for much more inclusive political boundaries – while others continue to assert the hegemony of nationalist norms. While nationalism is contingent socio-historically, then, it is also very much contingent on people's broader ideological context(s) and sociopolitical orientations – a fact that my study fleshes out empirically through its exhaustive view into the range of positions that were articulated to reaffirm, modify and contest a number of nationalist norms.

IV. LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A question that fell beyond the scope of the present study is whether mass immigration generates *new* conceptions of collectivity or compels people to articulate their *existing* non-nationalist or anti-nationalist views. Such an examination would require a systematic comparison between the conversations I examine in the present study and historical accounts of diverse segments of the Greek national community dealing with ethnic plurality. In Chapter Two of my work, I did provide an overview of the historical background, but my study still did not engage in a sufficiently systematic and minute comparison between the past and the present.

In terms of its comparative potential, my study may also form a useful basis for research that may compare legal and sociocultural norms of national membership vis-à-vis immigration on a pan-European arena. While I did not engage in such a comparison

systematically, my discussion of the European context in Chapter One did indicate that other nations whose hegemonic narratives represented them as more or less ethnically homogeneous underwent processes of redefinition comparable to those of Greece. Examining the Greek case through a comparative lens may produce more insights than those already revealed in the present study.

Another area that I did not examine in the present study consists in the views of people who did not step up to argue publicly on the issue of national membership for immigrants – i.e., on any of the public discursive arenas I mined for data ranging from the Parliament to Facebook. On the basis of my study, what emerged as the main axis of conceptual differentiation was political ideology – in other words, the different views on national boundaries mapped neatly onto people’s different political beliefs or allegiances. Undoubtedly, this finding reflects the fact that my data consisted mostly of partisan voices. But what are some other social features, beliefs and experiences that are salient to the degree in which people embrace the nationalist ideology and respond to the prospect of ethnic plurality? A future study could build on the conceptual divergence revealed in my dissertation to examine how immigration prompts processes of national (re)definition among people not as embedded in partisan and established structures of power as politicians; people with no particular political roles or expediencies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamovsky, Ezequiel
2005 Euro-Orientalism and the Making of the Concept of Eastern Europe in France, 1810–1880. *The Journal of Modern History*, 77(3): 591-628.
- Akkerman, Tjitske
2012 Comparing Radical Right Parties in Government: Immigration and Integration Policies in Nine Countries (1996-2010). *West European Politics*, 35(3): 511-529.
- Alba, Richard
2005 Bright vs. Blurred Boundaries: Second-Generation Assimilation and Exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(1): 20-49.
- Alba, Richard, and Nee, Victor
1997 Rethinking Assimilation: Theory for a New Era of Immigration. *International Migration Review*, 31(4): 826-874.
- Anastasiadis, Themis
2010 Το πιο Δίκαιο Κοινωνικό Μέτρο Είναι να Αποφύγεις Πάση Θυσία τη Χρεοκοπία. [The Most Socially Just Measure Is to Avoid Bankruptcy at Any Cost.] *Proto Thema*, January 17.
- Andreouli, Eleni, and Howarth, Caroline
2012 National Identity, Citizenship, and Immigration: Putting Identity in Context. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 43(3): 361-382.
- Arendt, Hannah
1967 [1951] *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Armelagos, George J. and Goodman Alan H.
1998 Race, Racism and Anthropology. *In Building a New Bio-cultural Synthesis: Political-Economic Perspectives on Human Biology*. Goodman, Alan H. and Leatherman, Thomas L., eds. Pp. 359-378. The University of Michigan Press.
- Armstrong, John
1982 *Nations before Nationalism*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Anagnostou, Dia
2005 Deepening Democracy or Defending the Nation? The Europeanisation of Minority Rights and Greek citizenship. *West European Politics* 28(2): 335 – 357.
- Anderson, Benedict
1983 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Appadurai, Arjun

2003 Sovereignty without Territoriality: Notes for a Postnational Geography. *In* The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture. Setha M. Low and Denise Lawrence-Zúñiga, eds. Pp. 337-347. Blackwell.

Avgi

2013a Μειώνουν τις Αιτήσεις για Ιθαγένεια μέσω του Κώδικα Μετανάστευσης. [They Are Reducing the Applications for Nationality through the Migration Code]. August 31.

2013b Ζήτημα Ισοπολιτείας η Ιθαγένεια. [Nationality a Matter of Equality]. April 3.

Baldwin-Edwards, Martin

2005 Statistical Data on Immigrants in Greece: An Analytic Study of Available Data and Recommendations for Conformity with European Union Standards. Mediterranean Migration Observatory. Retrieved from: <http://aei.pitt.edu/2870/>

Balibar, Etienne

1991 The Nation Form: History and Ideology. *In* Race, Nation, Class. Balibar, Etienne and Wallerstein, Immanuel, eds. Pp.: 86-106. London: Verso.

Barth, Fredrik

1969 Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Bauböck, R., Ersbøll, E., Groenendijk, K. and Waldrauch, H., eds.

2006 Acquisition and Loss of Nationality. Policies and Trends in 15 European States. Summary and Recommendations. Results of the EU-project: the Acquisition of Nationality in EU Member States: Rules, Practices and Quantitative Developments (natac). Vienna: Institute for European Integration Research, Austrian Academy of Sciences

Bauman, Zygmunt

1995 Making and Unmaking of Strangers. *Thesis Eleven*, 43(1): 1-16.

Baumgartner, Jody C., and Morris, Jonathan, S.

2010 MyFaceTube Politics: Social Networking Web Sites and Political Engagement of Young Adults. *Social Science Computer Review*, 28(1): 24-44.

Bhabha, Homi

1990 Nation and Narration. London and New York: Routledge.

Blaut, James, M.

1992 The Theory of Cultural Racism. *Antipode*, 24(4): 289-299.

- boyd, danah m., and Ellison, Nicole B.
2008 Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 13(1): 210-230.
- Bourdieu, Pierre
1994 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bowen, John R.
2004 Does French Islam Have Borders? Dilemmas of Domestication in a Global Religious Field. *American Anthropologist*, 106(1): 43-55.
- Bernitz, Hedvig
2012 Country Report: Sweden. Florence, Italy: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advance Studies, EUDO Citizenship Observatory.
- Bertossi, Christophe and Hajjat, Abdellalli
2013 Country Report: France. Florence, Italy: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advance Studies, EUDO Citizenship Observatory.
- Bouillaud, Christophe
2007 La Legislation Italienne des Années 2001-2005 Porte-t-Elle la Marque des Nouvelles Droites? [Does Italian Legislation in the Years 2001-2005 Bear the Mark of New Rights?] *In* Extrême Droite et Pouvoir en Europe. [The Extreme Right and Power in Europe.] Delwit, Pascal and Poirier, Philippe, Roger, eds. Pp. 265-291. Brussels: Université de Bruxelles.
- Brubaker, Rogers
2004 In the Name of the Nation: Reflections on Nationalism and Patriotism. *Citizenship Studies*, 8(2): 115-127.
1990 Immigration, Citizenship, and the Nation-State in France and Germany: A Comparative Historical Analysis. *International Sociology*, 5(4): 379-407.
- Brubaker, Rogers, and Cooper, Frederick
2000 Beyond "Identity." *Theory and Society*, 29(1), 1-47.
- Byrne, Dara N.
2008 The Future of (the) 'Race': Identity, Discourse, and the Rise of Computer-Mediated Public Spheres. *In* Learning Race and Ethnicity: Youth and Digital Media. Anna Everett, ed. Pp. 15-39. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Chatterjee, Partha
1993 *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Christopoulos, Dimitris
2012 Ποιος είναι Έλληνας Πολίτης; [Who is a Greek citizen?]. Athens: Vivliorama.
- Clifford, James
1997 *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
1994 Diasporas. *Cultural Anthropology*, 9(3), 302-338
- Clogg, Richard
1987 *Parties and Elections in Greece: The Search for Legitimacy*. London: C. Hurst & Company.
- Cohen, Abner
1974 Introduction: The Lesson of Ethnicity. *In Urban Ethnicity*. Cohen, Abner, ed. London: Tavistock.
- Cohen, Ronald
1987 Ethnicity: Problem and Focus in Anthropology. *Annual Reviews in Anthropology*, 7: 379-403.
- Corbin, Juliet, and Strauss, Anselm C.
1998 *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Council of State
2013 Απόφαση 460/2013 [Ruling 460/2013]. Retrieved from <http://www.ste.gr/portal/page/portal/StE/ProsfaresApofaseis#a254>
- Cresswell, Tim
2006 *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World*. New York, London: Routledge.
- Delanty, Gerard
1995 *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Felix
1987 *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Detrez, Raymond
2003 Relations between Greeks and Bulgarians in the Pre-Nationalist Era: The *Gudilas* in Plovdiv. *In Greece and the Balkans: Identities, Perceptions and Cultural Encounters since the Enlightenment*. Dimitris Tziouvas, ed. Pp. 30-67. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Dimitrova, Daniela V.; Shehata, Adam; Strömbäck, Jesper; and Nord, Lars W.
2011 The Effects of Digital Media on Political Knowledge and Participation in Election Campaigns: Evidence from Panel Data. *Communication Research*, XX(X): 1-24.
- Dimoulis, Dimitris and Christopoulos, Dimitris
2010 Ιθαγένεια και Μετανάστευση: Να Μετατοπίσουμε το Κατώφλι του Αποκλεισμού [Nationality and Immigration: We Should Move the Threshold of Exclusion.] *Avgi*, February 28.
- Donath, Judith, and boyd, danah
2004 Public Displays of Connection. *BT Technology Journal*, 22(4): 71-82.
- Donnelly, Jack
2013 *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice*. Cornell University Press.
- Duncan, Fraser, and van Hecke, Steven
2008 Immigration and the Transnational European Centre-Right: A Common Programmatic Response? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15(3): 432-452.
- Ehrkamp, Patricia, and Leitner, Helga
2003 Beyond National Citizenship: Turkish Immigrants and the (Re)Construction of Citizenship in Germany. *Urban Geography*, 24(2): 127-146.
- Eleftherotypia*
2013 Συνεργάτης της Χρυσής Αυγής Μηνύει την “Εργατική Αλληλεγγύη” [A Golden Dawn Associate Sues the “Labor Solidarity.”] June 25.
2010a Η Δήλωση του Αντώνη Σαμαρά για τα Πολιτικά Δικαιώματα των Μεταναστών. [Antonis Samaras’ Statement on Immigrants’ Political Rights.] January 11.
2010b Διαδικτυακή Δημοκρατία [Online Democracy]. January 3.
- Empeirikou, L. and Skoulariki, A.
2008 Ο «Αλυτρωτισμός των Σκοπίων» or η Αποσιωπημένη Μειονοτική Διάσταση του Μακεδονικού[...]. *Avgi, Enthemata*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.kemo.gr/index.php?sec=show&item=122>
- Encyclopedia Britannica
2007 *Genus*. Retrieved November 29, 2007 from <http://search.eb.com/eb/article-9036443>
- Ersbøll, Eva
2013 Country Report: Denmark. Florence, Italy: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advance Studies, EUDO Citizenship Observatory.

- Espiritu, Yen Le
1999 Disciplines Unbound: Notes on Sociology and Ethnic Studies. *Contemporary Sociology*, 28(5): 510-514.
- Fernandes, Juliana; Giurcanu, Magda; Bowers, Kevin W.; and Neely, Jeffrey C.
2010 The Writing on the Wall: A Content Analysis of College Students' Facebook Groups for the 2008 Presidential Election. *Mass Communication and Society*, 13(5): 653-675.
- Fiske, Susan T.
2004 *Social Beings: A Core Motives Approach to Social Psychology*. Courier-Westford.
- Foblets, Marie-Claire; Yanasmayan, Zeynep; and Wautelet, Patrick
2013 Country Report: Belgium. Florence, Italy: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advance Studies, EUDO Citizenship Observatory.
- Gan, Faith; Teo, Joo Leng; and Detenber, Benjamin H.
2005 Framing the Battle for the White House: A Comparison of Two National Newspapers' Coverage of the 2000 United States Presidential Election. *Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies*, 67(5): 441-467.
- Gefou-Madianou, Dimitra
1999 Cultural Polyphony and Identity Formation: Negotiating Tradition in Attica. *American Ethnologist*, 26(2): 412-443.
- Gellner, Ernest
1983 *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Ghorashi, Halleh
2012 "Dutchness" and the Migrant "Other:" From Suppressed Superiority to Explicit Exclusion? *Focaal – Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology*, 56(1): 106-111.
- Gieryn, Thomas, F.
1983 Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists. *American Sociological Review*, 48(6): 781-795.
- Gil de Zúñiga, Homero; Jung, Nakwon; and Valenzuela, Sebastián
2012 Social Media Use for News and Individuals' Social Capital, Civic Engagement and Political Participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(3): 319-336.

- Gilroy, Paul
2004 *Between Camps: Nations, Cultures and the Allure of Race*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Givens, Terri, and Luedtke, Adam
2005 European Immigration Policies in Comparative Perspective: Issue Salience, Partisanship and Immigrant Rights. *Comparative European Politics*, 3(1): 1-22.
- Glick-Schiller, Nina, Basch, Linda, and Szanton-Blanc, Cristina
1995 From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68(1): 48–63.
1992 Transnationalism: A New Analytic Framework for Understanding Migration. *In Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered*. *In* Glick-Schiller, Nina, Basch, Linda, and Szanton-Blanc, Cristina, eds. Pp. 1-24. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Goldberg, David T.
2006 Racial Europeanization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 29(2): 331-364.
- Gravlee, Clarence
2005 Ethnic Classification in Southeastern Puerto Rico: The Cultural Model of "Color". *Social Forces*, 83(3): 949-970.
- Groshek, Jacob, and Al-Rawi, Ahmed
2013 Public Sentiment and Critical Framing in Social Media Content during the 2012 U.S. Presidential Campaign. *Social Science Computer review*, 31(5): 563-576.
- Gupta, Akhil and Ferguson James
1992 Beyond "Culture:" Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1): 6-23.
- Gustafson, Per
2005 The Subtle Nature of Facebook Politics: Swedish Social Network Site Users and Political Participation. *New Media and Society*, 14(7): 1111-1127.
- Gustafsson, Nils
2012 International Migration and National Belonging in the Swedish Debate on Dual Citizenship. *Acta Sociologica*, 48(1): 5-19.
- Guttman, Amy, and Thompson, Dennis
2004 *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hailbronner, Kay
2012 *Country Report: Germany*. Florence, Italy: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advance Studies, EUDO Citizenship Observatory.

- Hale, Henry E.
2004 Explaining Ethnicity. *Comparative Political Studies*, 37(4): 458-485.
- Haraway, Donna
1988 Excerpts from *Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective*. *Feminist Studies* 14(3): 575 – 599.
- Herzfeld, Michael
2002 *The Absent Presence: Discourses of Crypto-Colonialism*. *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 101(4): 899-926.
- Hesse, Barnor
2007 *Racialized modernity: An analytics of white mythologies*. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(4): 643-663
- Hirschon, Renee
1998 *Heirs of the Greek Catastrophe: The Social Life of Asia Minor Refugees in Piraeus*. Armenian Research Center collection. Berghahn Books.
- Hoare, Quintin and Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey, eds.
1971 *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J.
1990 *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Honohan, Iseult
N.d. *Ius Soli* Citizenship. EUDO CITIZENSHIP Policy Brief No. 1. Florence, Italy: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advance Studies, EUDO Citizenship Observatory. Retrieved from eudo-citizenship.eu/docs/ius-soli-policy-brief.pdf
- Hughes, Ernest C.
1994 [1948] *On Work, Race and the Sociological Imagination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hutchinson, John
2005 *Nations as Zones of Conflict*. London: Sage.
- I Kathimerini*
2010 Έντονη Αντιπαράθεση για την Ιθαγένεια [Intense Confrontation on Nationality]. January 10.

Institute of Labor GSEE

2009 Η Ελληνική Οικονομία και η Απασχόληση [Greek Economy and Employment]. Annual Report. Athens. Retrieved from http://www.inegsee.gr/sitefiles/files/EKTHESI_11.pdf

Isin, Engin F. and Turner, Brian S.

2007 Investigating citizenship: An agenda for citizenship studies. *Citizenship Studies* 11(1): 5-17.

Jenkins, Richard

2008 *Rethinking Ethnicity*. 2nd Edition. London: Sage.

Kapsalis, Apostolos

2010 Η Ιθαγένεια και το Πανανθρώπινο Δικαίωμα στη Μετανάστευση. [Nationality and the Universal Right to Migration.] *Avgi*, February 7.

Kasimis, Charalambos and Kasimi, Chrysa

2004 Greece: A History of Migration. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationinformation.org>

Kasimis, Charalambos and Papadopoulos, Apostolos

2006 The Multifunctional Role of Migrants in the Greek Countryside: Implications for the Rural Economy and Society. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31(1): 99-127

Karakasidou, Anastasia

1997 *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia 1870-1990*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Karamanoli, Eva

2013 Κατά του Νόμου για την Ιθαγένεια Αποφάσισε το ΣτΕ [The Council of State Decided Against the Nationality Law]. *I Kathimerini*, February 6.

Katsounaki, Maria

2009 Ήταν εκεί, αλλά όχι ανάμεσά μας [They Were There, but not Among Us]. *I Kathimerini*, October 6.

Keaton, Tricia

2005 Arrogant Assimilationism: National Identity Politics and African-Origin Muslim Girls in the Other France. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 36(4): 405-423.

Keza, Laurie

2009a Τα Σύνορα της Καρδιάς [The Borders of the Heart.] *To Vima*, December 23.
2009b Χωρίς Πατρίδα. [Without a Homeland.] *To Vima*, November 7.

- Kitromilides, Paschalis
1989 'Imagined Communities' and the Origin of the National Question in the Balkans. *European History Quarterly*, 19(2): 149-194.
- Koopmans, Ruud, and Ersanilli Evelyn
2010 Rewarding Integration? Citizenship Regulations and the Socio-Cultural Integration of Immigrants in the Netherlands, France and Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36 (5): 773-791.
- Koopmans, Ruud; Michalowski, Ines; and Waibel, Stine
2012 Citizenship Rights for Immigrants: National Political Processes and Cross-National Convergence in Western Europe, 1980-2008. *American Journal of Sociology* 117 (4): 1202-1245.
- Kostarelou, Eleni
2013 Αξέχαστη (!) και δυσοίωνη η 3η Μαρτίου [March 3: Unforgettable (!) and Ominous]. *Eleftherotypia*, March 4.
- Kostopoulos, Tasos
2008 Το Μακεδονικό της Θράκης [The Macedonian Issue of Thrace], Athens: Vivliorama
2010 Η Απαγορευμένη Γλώσσα [The Forbidden Language], Athens: Vivliorama.
- Lamont, Michele, and Molnár, Virag
2002 The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28: 167-195.
- Lampe, Cliff; Ellison, Nicole; and Steinfield, Charles
2007 A Familiar Face(book): Profile Elements as Signals in an Online Social Network. Paper presented at the CHI 2007 Online Representations of Self Conference, San Jose, CA, April 28-May 3.
- Lahav, Gallya
2004 *Immigration and Politics in the New Europe: Reinventing Borders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leach, Edmund R.
1964 *Political Systems of Highland Burma*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Lentin, Alana
2008 Europe and the Silence about Race. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 11(4): 487-503.

- Lewis, Kevin; Kaufman, Jason; Gonzalez, Marco; Wimmer, Andreas; and Christakis, Nicholas
 2008 Tastes, Ties, and Time: A New Social Network Dataset Using Facebook.com. *Social Networks*, 30(4): 330-342.
- Lygeros, Stavros
 2010 Νομοσχέδιο για την Ιθαγένεια: Ανάγκη, Παγίδες, Ιδεολογήματα. [The Nationality Bill: Need, Traps, Ideological Constructs.] *I Kathimerini*, January 3.
- Mahler, Sarah J. and Pessar, Patricia R.
 2001 Gendered Geographies of Power: Analyzing Gender across Transnational Spaces. *Identities*, 7(4): 41-59
- Mahler, Sarah J.
 2012 *Culture as Comfort*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Malkki, Lisa
 1992 Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1): 24-44.
- Margaritis, Giorgos
 2005 *Ανεπιθύμητοι Συμπατριώτες: Στοιχεία για την Καταστροφή των Μειονοτήτων της Ελλάδας: Εβραίοι, Τσάμηδες*. [Unwanted Compatriots: Evidence on the Destruction of Greece's Minorities: Jews, Chams.] Athens: Vivliorama
- Marshall, Thomas H.
 1964 Citizenship and social class. *In Class, citizenship and social development*. Marshall, Thomas H. (Ed.) Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Martín-Pérez, Alberto, and Moreno-Fuentes Francisco Javier
 2012 Migration and Citizenship Law in Spain: Path-Dependency and Policy Change in a Recent Country of Immigration. *International Migration Review*, 46(3): 6225-655.
- Massey, Douglas S.
 2007 *Categorically Unequal: The American Stratification System*. New York: The Russell Sage Foundation.
- Mautner, Gerlinde H.
 2008 Analyzing Newspapers, Magazines and Other Print Media. *In Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Ruth Wodak and Michal Krzyzanowski, eds. Pp. 30-53. Basingstoke, UK and New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Mavrogordatos, George T.
 1983 *Stillborn Republic: Social Coalitions and Party Strategies in Greece, 1922-1936*. University of California Press.

- Mazower, Mark
2005 *Salonica, City of Ghosts*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Melander, Ingrid
2010 Greek parliament passes austerity bill. Reuters, March 5. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/03/05/greece-vote-idUSATH00527020100305?type=usDollarRpt>
- Miller, Daniel, and Slater, Don
2000 *The Internet: An Ethnographic Approach*. Oxford: Berg.
- Mooritsen, Per, and Olsen, Tore Vincents
2013 Denmark between Liberalism and Nationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(4): 691-710.
- Omi, Michael and Winant Howard
1994 Racial Formations. *In Racial Formations in the United States*. Omi, Michael and Winant, Howard, eds. Pp. 359-378. New York and London: Routledge.
- Ong, Aihwa
2006 Mutations in Citizenship. *Theory, Culture, and Society*, 23(2-3): 499-531.
- Özkişirli, Umut
2003 The nation as an Artichoke? A Critique of Ethnosymbolist Interpretations of Nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism* 9(3): 339-355.
- Özkişirli, Umut and Sofos, Spyros
2008 *Tormented by History: Nationalism in Greece and Turkey*. London: Hurst Publishers Ltd.
- Panourgia, Neni
2009 *Dangerous Citizens: The Greek Left and the Terror of the State*. Fordham University Press.
- Papachelas, Alexis
2007 Το Βιβλίο [The Book]. Οι Νέοι Φάκελοι [The New Folders]. Skai. Retrieved from <http://folders.skai.gr/main/theme?locale=el&id=17>
- Papagiannis, Kostas
2013 Αθανασίου: Μετά τα 18 η Ιθαγένεια σε Παιδιά Μεταναστών [Athanasίου: Nationality to Immigrants Children over 18]. *Avgi*, June 1.
- Papandreou, George
2009 Speech at the Global Forum on Migration and Development 2009. November 4. Retrieved from

<http://papandreou.gr/%CE%BF%CE%BC%CE%B9%CE%BB%CE%AF%CE%B1-%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF-3%CE%BF-%CF%80%CE%B1%CE%B3%CE%BA%CF%8C%CF%83%CE%BC%CE%B9%CE%BF-%CF%86%CF%8C%CF%81%CE%BF%CF%85%CE%BC-%CE%B3%CE%B9%CE%B1-%CF%84%CE%B7-%CE%BC%CE%B5/>

Park, Namsu; Fee, Kerk F.; Valenzuela, Sebastián

2009 Being Immersed in Social Networking Environment: Facebook Groups, Uses and Gratifications, and Social Outcomes. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 12(6): 729-733.

Parsanoglou, Dimitris

2000 Όταν οι Κοινωνικές Επιστήμες Αναπαράγουν Ιδεολογικά Άλλοθι του «Ξαφνιάσματος» της Ελληνικής Κοινωνίας από τη Μετανάστευση. [When the Social Sciences Reproduce Ideological Alibis of the Greek Society Being Taken Aback by Immigration.] *In Μετανάστες και Μειονότητες: Λόγος και Πολιτικές.* [Immigrants and Minorities: Discourse and Policies.] Pavlou, Miltos, and Skoulariki, Athina, eds. Pp. 287-306. Athens: Vivliorama.

Pautz, Hartwig

2005 The Politics of Identity in Germany: the *Leitkultur* Debate. *Race and Class*, 46(4): 39-52.

Pavlou, Miltos

2009a Από το Μύθο της Ομοιογένειας στη Συμμετοχική Δημοκρατία [From the Myth of Homogeneity to Participatory Democracy]. *Eleftherotypia*, December 2.

2009b Δημοκρατικό Έλλειμμα [Democratic Deficit]. *I Kathimerini*, November 29.

2009c Δημοκρατικό Έλλειμμα [Democratic Deficit]. *I Kathimerini*, August 2.

Pavlou, Miltos and Triandafyllidou, Anna

2009 Αξίζει να Φανταστούμε μια Νέα Ελληνική Κοινωνία [It is Worth Imagining a New Greek Society]. Retrieved from: <http://blogs.eliamep.gr/admin/axizi-na-fantastoume-mia-nea-elliniki-kinonia-miltos-pavlou-ke-anna-triantafyllidou/>

Pentzopoulos, Dimitris

1962 The Balkan Exchange of Minorities and its Impact upon Greece. The Hague.

Pieterse, Jan N.

2007 Ethnicities and Global Multi-culture: Pants for an Octopus. Rowman and Littlefield.

2001 Hybridity, So What? The Anti-Hybridity Backlash and the Riddles of Recognition. *Theory, Culture, and Society*, 18(2-3): 219-245.

Portes, Alejandro and Zhou, Min

1993 The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530: 74-96.

Proto Thema

2010 Ιθαγένεια, Ελληνάρες και Εξετάσεις «Ελληνικότητας.» [Nationality, *Ellinares*, and tests of “Greekness.”] January 24

Reuters

2010 Timeline: Greece's economic crisis. February 3. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/02/03/us-greece-economy-events-idUSTRE6124EL20100203>

Roudometof, Victor

1998 From Rum Millet to Greek Nation: Enlightenment, Secularization, and National Identity in Ottoman Balkan Society, 1453-1821. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 16(1): 11-48.

Said, Edward

1979 *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.

Samaras, Antonis

2010 Letter to the Minister of the Interior. *Eleftherotypia*, January 11.

Sanjek, Roger

1996 The Enduring Inequalities of Race. *In Race*. Gregory, Staven and Sanjek, Roger, eds. Pp. 1-17. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Sassen, Saskia

2006 *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

2003 Citizenship Destabilized. *Liberal Education*, 89(2), 14-21.

Savvidis, Panagiotis

2010a 800.000 Λαθρομετανάστες: Οι 700.000 Είναι Ακόμη Εδώ και Ζητούν Ιθαγένεια. [800,000 Illegal Immigrants: 700,000 Are Still Here Asking for Nationality.] *Proto Thema*, January 24.

2010b Επτά στους 10 Διαφωνούν με την «Εύκολη» Ιθαγένεια. [Seven out of ten disagree with “easy” nationality.] *Proto Thema*, January 1.

Sawyer, Caroline and Wray, Helena

2012 *Country Report: United Kingdom* Florence, Italy: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advance Studies, EUDO Citizenship Observatory.

Schlozman, Kay Lehman; Verba, Sidney; and Brady, Henry E.

2010 Weapons of the Strong? Participatory Inequality and the Internet. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(2): 487-509.

- Sibley, David
1995 *Geographies of Exclusion*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Anthony D.
2008 *The Cultural Foundations of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant and Republic*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
1998 *Nationalism and Modernism*. London: Routledge.
- Someritis, Richardos
2010 Οπου Ζεις Πατρίζεις. [Homeland Is Where You Live.] *To Vima*, January 21.
- Soysal, Yasemin
1996 Changing citizenship in Europe: remarks on post-national membership and the national state. In *Citizenship, nationality and migration in Europe* Cesarani, D. and Fulbrook, M., eds. Pp. 17-29. London; New York: Routledge.
- Spradley, James P.
1979 *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stern, Joachim and Valchars, Gerd
2013 *Country Report: Austria*. Florence, Italy: European University Institute, Robert Schuman Centre for Advance Studies, EUDO Citizenship Observatory.
- Stocking, George W.
1998 *The Critique of Racial Formalism*. In *Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Stocking, George, W., ed. Pp. 161-194. New York: The Free Press.
- Strauss, Anselm L. and Corbin, Juliet M.
N.d. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Streeck, Wolfgang
2013 *The Politics of Public Debt: Neoliberalism, Capitalist Development, and the Restructuring of the State*. MPIfG Discussion Paper, No. 13/7. Retrieved from http://www.mpifg.de/pu/mpifg_dp/dp13-7.pdf
- Taguieff, Pierre-André
2001[1987] *The Force of Prejudice: On Racism and its Doubles*. Hassan Melehy, trans. University of Minnesota Press.
- Telegraph
2011 *Timeline of a crisis: how Greece's tragedy unfolded*. June 16. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/economics/8580720/Timeline-of-a-crisis-how-Greeces-tragedy-unfolded.html>

- Todorova, Maria
1997 *Imagining the Balkans*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Towner, Terri L.
2000 All Political Participation is Socially Networked? New Media and the 2012 Election. *Social Science Computer Review*, 31(5): 527-541.
- Triandafyllidou, Anna
2009 Greek Immigration Policy at the Turn of the 21st Century. Lack of Political Will or Purposeful Mismanagement? *European Journal of Migration and Law*, 11, 159-177.
2001 *Immigrants and National Identity in Europe*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Triandafyllidou, Anna; Calloni Marina; and Mikrakis Antonis
1997 New Greek Nationalism. *Sociological Research Online* 2(1).
- Triandafyllidou, Anna and Maroukis, Thanos
2010 *Immigration to Greece of the 21st Century*. Athens: Kritiki.
- Trouillot, Michel, R.
2003 *Global Transformations: Anthropology and the Global World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tsitselikis, Konstantinos
2006 Citizenship in Greece: Present Challenges for Future Changes. *In Multiple Citizenship as a Challenge to European Nation-States*. Devorah Kalekin-Fishman and Pirrko Pitkänen, eds. Pp. 145-170. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Tsoukalas, Constantine
2000 The Irony of Symbolic Reciprocities – The Greek Meaning of ‘Europe’ as a Historical Inversion of the European Meaning of ‘Greece’. *In The Meaning of Europe*. Mikael af Malborg and Bo Stråth, eds. Pp. 27-50. Oxford: Berg.
- Turner, Brian S.
1997 Citizen Studies: a General Theory. *Citizenship*, 1(1): 5-18.
1990 Outline of a Theory of Citizenship. *Sociology*, 24(2): 189-217.
- Tzanelli, Rodanthi
2006 ‘Not My Flag!’ Citizenship and Nationhood in the Margins of Europe. (Greece, October 2000/2003). *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 29(1): 27-49.
2002 Haunted by the “Enemy” Within: Brigandage, Vlachian/Albanian Greekness, Turkish “Contamination,” and Narratives of Greek Nationhood in the Dilessi/Marathon Affair (1870). *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 20(1): 47-74.

- Valtysson, Bjarki
2012 Facebook as a Digital Public Sphere: Processes of Colonization and Emancipation
tripleC, 10(1): 77-91.
- Vasilaki, Rosa
2010 Πολυπολιτισμικότητα και Αντιεθνικός Λόγος στη Σύγχρονη Ελλάδα: Μια Κριτική
Επισκόπηση. [Multiculturalism and Anti-Nationalist Discourse in Contemporary
Greece: A Critical Review.] *Ελληνική Επιθεώρηση Πολιτικής Επιστήμης* [Greek
Political Science Review], 36: 5-36.
- Verdery, Katherine
1994 Ethnicity, Nationalism, and State-making. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: Past
and Future. In The Anthropology of Ethnicity. Beyond "Ethnic Groups and
Boundaries."* Hans Vermeulen and Cora Govers, eds. Pp. 33-58. Amsterdam: Het
Spinhuis.
1993 Wither "Nation" and "Nationalism?" *Daedalus*, 122(3): 37-46.
- Verkaaik, Oskar
2010 The Cachet Dilemma: Ritual and Agency in New Dutch Nationalism. *American
Ethnologist* 37(1): 69-82.
- Vogli, Elpida
2008 Έλληνες το Γένος [Greek by descent]. *Panepistimiakes Ekdoseis Kritis*.
- Williams, Brackette
1989 A Class Act: Anthropology and the Race to Nation across Ethnic Terrain. *Annual
Review of Anthropology* 18: 401-444.
- Wimmer, Andreas and Glick-Schiller, Nina
2002 Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and
the Social Sciences. *Global Networks*, 2(4): 301-334.
- Weber, Max
1978 [1922] Ethnic Groups. *In Economy and Society*. Roth, G., and Wittich, C., eds.
Pp. 385-398 Berkeley: University of California Press 1978: 385-98. Originally
published in 1922 but written before 1914.
- Wooley, Julia K.; Limperos, Anthony M.; and Oliver, Mary Beth
2010 The 2008 Presidential Election, 2.0: A Content Analysis of User-Generated
Political Facebook Groups. *Mass Communication and Society*, 13(5): 631-652.
- Zincone, Giovanna and Basili, Marzia
2013 Country Report: Italy. Florence, Italy: European University Institute, Robert
Schuman Centre for Advance Studies, EUDO Citizenship Observatory.

Zhang, Weiwu; Johnson, Thomas J.; Seltzer, Trent; and Bichard, Shannon L.
2010 The Revolution Will Be Networked: The Influence of Social Networking Sites of
Political Attitudes and Behavior *Social Science Computer Review* 28(1): 75-92.

Zhao, Shanyang, Grasmuck, Sherri, and Martin, Jason
2008 Identity Construction on Facebook: Digital Empowerment in Anchored
Relationships. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(5): 1816-1836.

VITA

CYNTHIA H. MALAKASIS

- 1998-2002 National Merit Scholarship,
The University of Kansas,
Lawrence, KS
- 2002 B.S. in Journalism and International Studies,
The University of Kansas,
Lawrence, KS
- 2004-2005 Reporter and Writer,
The Anniston Star,
Anniston, AL
- 2006-2008 Full Tuition Scholarship and Teaching Assistantship,
Florida International University,
Miami, FL
- 2008 Master's in Comparative Sociology,
Florida International University,
Miami, FL
- 2008-2009 Full Tuition Scholarship and Research Assistantship,
Miami-Florida European Union Center of Excellence,
Florida International University,
Miami, FL
- 2008-2014 Doctoral Studies,
Florida International University,
Miami, FL
- 2009-2010 Full Tuition Scholarship and Teaching Assistantship,
Florida International University,
Miami, FL
- 2011 Doctoral Evidence Acquisition Fellowship,
Florida International University,
Miami, FL
- 2012 Doctoral Year Fellowship,
Florida International University,
Miami, FL

PRESENTATIONS

“Demarcating the Nation on Facebook: The Case of Greece,” American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, November 20, 2013

“Greece, Europe and the "Others":(Re)Defining the Nation in the Margins of Europe,” American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting, Montreal, CA, November 19, 2011

““Our Ancestors’ Bones Will Rattle:’ The Nation’s Past(s) as Fetters on Changing Conceptions of Collectivity”, International Conference, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, *Mediterranean Topographies*, Ann Arbor, MI, April 9, 2011

“Applying to the NSF,” Grant Application Workshop, Florida International University, Sociology and Anthropology Graduate Students Organization (SAGSA), Miami, FL, April 7, 2010

“Immigration and Nationalism in Greece,” International Conference, Bulgarian Academy of Science, *Migration to and from Southeastern Europe*, Sofia, June 3, 2008

“Immigration and Nationalism in Greece,” 2007 Trans-Atlantic Summer Institute (TASI), *Immigration, Citizenship and the Future of Multiculturalism*, The University of Minnesota, Center for German and European Studies, Minneapolis, August 5, 2007