

## **(Re-) Settled People and Moving Heritage – Borders, Heirs, Inheritance**

Meglana Zlatkova  
University of Plovdiv, Bulgaria  
m\_zlatkova@yahoo.com

**Abstract.** This paper discusses inheritance after migration on both sides of the Bulgarian-Turkish border. A specific approach to the (re-)settled people and moving objects, inheritance and patrimonialisation of the movement, instrumentalized by the (state) border, is applied in a comparative way to two specific groups: the Bulgarians from Aegean Thrace, or the so called “Thracian Bulgarians” resettled after the Balkan wars, and the Turks who were born in Bulgaria and resettled in Turkey during the several migration waves in the twentieth century in two localities – Tsarevo, Bulgaria and Edirne, Turkey. In this study, heritage is thought of as inheritance from an activist position, as ritualised and everyday life practices, as re-actualisation of meanings, network of heirs and circulating objects – values, symbols, knowledge and memory. The paper analyses practices of crossing the border of heirs as: as tourists, as explorers of their origins, as neighbours inhabiting border territories. Nowadays, on an institutional level, they are engaged in developing projects that aim at transborder collaboration and in exhibiting cultural heritage with a focus on the levels of cultural diversity in the places close to the border.

**Keywords:** mobility, inheritance, heirs, cultural capital, border

Migration triumphs over borders but it creates new ones by reinforcing existing divisions. The political border can stop people with fences and border control but it cannot counteract the symbolic transgressions, the reworked collective memories of individuals and groups of people moving across, or the interiorised shared history in relating family and autobiographical stories. Borders problematise “otherness” along with what is “ours,” and a mobile person puts worlds side by side, compares, contrasts, interprets, and makes use of cultural models, transfers meanings, signs, symbols, objects, knowledge and skills. The inheritance concept localises and connects individuals, groups, and communities by means of identifying, categorizing, and ordering them; it mobilises symbolic resources and capital. The concept of inheritance as legacy, patrimony, and heritage,<sup>1</sup> contains different levels of institutionalisation and forms of socialisation, which have “precipitated” community and group mechanisms of mobilising social connections and continuity of culture, inheriting, and

heirs. Thus, the understanding of heritage here is rather closer to UNESCO's definition:<sup>2</sup>

The 'intangible cultural heritage' means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. [...]

The anthropological approach to the heritage and mobility of the people is focusing on the process and practices of construction, inheritance and (political) uses of the cultural heritage even in the cases when others people heritage is negotiable between two national states.

What are the consequences, though, if these people move; how do they make use of their inheritance as cultural and symbolic capital in the new context; how do they inscribe their experience in their new environment?

This text offers a specific point of view towards settled people and moving heritage, towards inheriting and moving, instrumentalised with the help of the border – the border between Bulgaria and Turkey – and two specific groups: the so called "Thracian Bulgarians" who resettled in Bulgaria after the Balkan Wars, and the "Bulgarian Turks" who moved from Bulgaria to Turkey as a result of several outgoing migrant waves in the twentieth century.<sup>3</sup> In other words, here inheritance reflects the sense of the act of inheriting, of its practices, of the reactualisation of meanings, and of a network of heirs mobilised by moving values, symbols, knowledge, and memory. A spatial and chronological transgression of borders delocalises (figuratively and/or literally) the heirs who have no experience of their own from their ancestors' birthplace. To them, it is a symbolic homeland, unknown experience, and memory that needs to be interiorised and recovered when it becomes physically possible to return. With this in mind, I embrace the idea that inheritance of migration is not simply an object, it is also a process of inheriting social experience and cultural institutionalisation, both "value" and "norm" (Givre, 2012: 45). The resettlement is a contested memory, resource of construction of identity and social positioning in the new (home) society. The heritage here is considered as cultural capital in its three forms as Pierre Bourdieu defines them:

The embodied state, i.e., in the form of long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body; in the objectified state, in the form of cultural goods [...] and in the institutionalized state [...]. (Bourdieu, 1986: 243)

The border crossing, mobility and the liminal social position of the migrants and resettlers poses interesting research questions: How the embodied state of migration of the first generation is transmitted as heritage for the next descendants, what are the two frames of references and (national) ideologies that objectify and legitimise this heritage and what are the institutional forms of objectivity in both societies. The case study challenge us to upgrade the understanding of cultural heritage and inheritance in times of change and to answer the questions: How heritage is used by heirs as cultural capital and when it is possible to “invent the tradition,” to re-articulate values and to convert capitals in times of transition for both Bulgarian and Turkish societies? How the “hidden” in the private family life heritage (as the origins both for Turks or resettlers from Thrace during the socialism) was re-evaluated after 1989 and has had an access to the public life in institutionalized and objectified form? How the inheritance as a process of identification is possible in cases of migration towards majority and mobility nowadays?

The case presented here will be analysed not so much historically – as the partitioning of the region of Thrace among Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey by means of political borders and the shift of population as a result of intergovernmental agreements – but rather from the point of view of the forms of crossing the border as well as of instrumentalising and inheriting migration nowadays. The study is comparative, and the fieldwork was carried out between 2009 and 2012 in Tsarevo, Ahtopol, Kiten, Primorsko, Kostinbrod, Brodilovo, Kirdzhali, Plovdiv, and Varna in Bulgaria, as well as Edirne and Istanbul in Turkey, with the methodology of “multi-sited ethnography” (Marcus, 1995). As my research interest was directed towards the border regions and the ways of crossing of the border, the major part of the work took place in two towns close to the border and influenced by migration – Tsarevo (Bulgaria) and Edirne, Turkey (Zlatkova, 2012).

I use the approach of urban anthropology to study the shifting states of the heritage of migration, that could be observed in towns. The urban settlement, following the Bourdieu’s terminology, is approached as an interaction between an objectified sociality, inscribed in the physical framework and established context, codification of behaviour, specific

habitat and interiorised sociality (urban habitus), i.e. the ability of the urban residents (migrants and their heirs) to appropriate and produce the heritage through their activities, practices, symbols, etc.<sup>4</sup> The heritage of migration is a concept including the institutionalised form of constructing identities but also the late-modern mobility of descendants' memories, objects, ideas, and experiences in the process of crossing the political border again in order to "find" their heritage and come in possession of their predecessors' legacy.

An important element in interpreting this negotiation of inheritance is the proximity of the border and the transition from a forbidden to a crossable national border. This specific viewpoint allows us to analyze the variety of "contradictions" in the process of mutual signification, which lend importance to the different dimensions of "heritage." It explains why Pierre Bourdieu's metaphor describing different forms of "contradictions of inheritance" (see Bourdieu, 1999; Penkova, 2012) turned out to be an appropriate activist approach to the problem of migration and inheriting social and cultural models from the first generation. Ritualized forms of crossing the border are part of the institutional life of both migrant groups and have a place in the personal experience and memories of the people inhabiting the border territories.

Throughout the twentieth century, defining the border between Bulgaria and Turkey has specific dynamics dependent on societal visions in the two neighbouring countries. It was frequently changed after the Balkan Wars 1912–1913 and was closed for people to cross freely after World War 2. Its status of "the forbidden and strictly guarded border," to a large extent synonymous with "the Iron Curtain" up to 1989, was linked to a number of regulated refugee and migration waves of people from both countries.<sup>5</sup> The checkpoint procedures were liberalized in the 1990s. In 2001 Turkey waved the visa requirement for Bulgarian citizens and more than a million tourists from Bulgaria visited the neighbour country within the next three years.<sup>6</sup> The status of the border and the regulations with regard to crossing it changed again in 2004 when Bulgaria became part of NATO and once more in 2007 when the country joined the EU.<sup>7</sup>

In what ways, however, does the opening of the border influence such phenomena as constructing heritage, transfer of values, interaction with others, and (re-) constructing territories of inheritance? The tasks of the field research were to study how present descendants experience the mi-

gration heritage,<sup>8</sup> how state and local institutions take part in recognising and acknowledging the inheritance of the other, whether border territories include in their local policies the inherited diversity of migrations and how.

The hypothesis I would like to formulate at the beginning of this text is that the inheritance of migration, of moving in space, maintains the liminal (social) position of the re-settlers on both sides of the Bulgarian-Turkish border and is a resource for constructing identities on different scales. The forbidden border, the one that divides people, the one that distinguishes between Bulgarian and Turkish citizens, categorizes them and separates them from their homes and places of birth, requires these people to settle on the wrong side of the border but cannot take away their dream to return. At the end of the twentieth century, when returning becomes possible, when some of them hold dual citizenship, the descendants take lessons in inheritance. They modernize the symbolic chronological transgressions of the border in order to reshape them into practices of crossing – as tourists, researchers, or neighbours; on an institutional level they are engaged in developing projects that aim at trans-border collaboration and in exhibiting cultural heritage with a focus on the layers of cultural diversity of migrants in the spaces and settlements close to the border. Upon the opening of the border, settlers follow the moving objects (symbols, values, memories) – they cross the border to return and ritualise memory.<sup>9</sup>

Chronological transgressions are most often expressed by ways of keeping the memory of one's birthplace and relating the trauma of having to leave it – stories are strongholds of memory, whether collective (national) or personal and familial. The forbidden border stops mobile people and it mobilizes the moving objects at a symbolic and everyday level; expressions of these are rituals of remembering and of respect, festive gatherings, celebrating the day of Thrace on 26th March, memberships at the Union of Thracian Associations in Bulgaria,<sup>10</sup> and every-day practices, such as residing in and inheriting the house of the refugees built by the first generation, keeping the family memory alive by telling the story to the younger generations, being knowledgeable about property left behind in the village: locations, gardens, buried treasure, lost family members on the way. With regard to the Turks who left Bulgaria,<sup>11</sup> there is a process of patrimonialisation signified by their returns to Bulgaria<sup>12</sup> and by the activities to commemorate the events of the 1980s, but

also by their membership in associations, federations, and confederations of the Balkan Peninsula Turks.<sup>13</sup> Still, the migrants keep coming back to Bulgaria to visit their relatives or their home place or send their children to study at Bulgarian universities.

Crossing the border and the travels of descendants, as well as the circulation of heritage via heirs will be illustrated with the town contexts of Tsarevo in Bulgaria and Edirne in Turkey and their local inheritance policies, practices of remembering, and residing in the town spaces of the migrants. The urban anthropology approach provides an opportunity to study the migration and heritage as process and negotiations between public and private, local, national and international, taking into account the individual biographical trajectories as trajectories in public urban spaces. The city space is a stake for a political struggle and the cultural heritage of the migrants gains an importance or is neglected by the dominant majority.

Assuming that all cities and towns are projections of the respective society and its values, we could begin by asking in what ways the Turkish and the Bulgarian societies “imagine”<sup>14</sup> the models that determine their identity and how these are related to inhabiting and constructing urban space. As this is too broad an issue and implies a different type of research, the context needs to be narrowed down to a few examples of crossing the border with the footnote that two types of migrants have constructed the town: the people who have settled here and those who moved out but have been returning by the agency of their descendants. In a larger sense, this hypothesis begs a few more interesting questions. How does Turkish society shape Edirne with the help of town-planning and the politics of constructing memory and how does Bulgarian society “imagine” this town in today’s reminiscences about the wars or about “Thracian Bulgarians”? How do the flows of tourists in the last decade or two make these places of collective memory their own?<sup>15</sup> How the “National Heritage” and National History of the State interacts in the urban landscape with the Heritage of the newcomers or the traces of previous urban inhabitants and the individual and collective stories of migration and resettlement? Because of the interactionist position underlying the research, which presupposes the subjective experience of time and space (Althabe, 1983), this text discusses the ways of negotiating cultural heritage while constructing the network spaces (Bokova, 2003) and circulating symbolic capital (Tarrus, 1989) in the Black Sea area of

Strandzha, which is situated on the territories of today's Bulgaria and Turkey, and in the town of Edirne, entails instrumentalizing the border. Although Tsarevo is only 30 km away from the border, there is no checkpoint to accommodate travellers;<sup>16</sup> by contrast, the border can be crossed about 20 km away from Edirne.

The comparative urban development approach would not be consistently applied in the text because it implies a dominating perspective of two national communities and a territorialized idea of the State, a type of analysis that belongs to a study of a different order. The symbolical urban landscape is a representation of different concepts of heritage and policies of patrimonialisation. The memorials, the sites and the rituals “officialize” the memories of various groups and communities that at different times have had a dominating position in the town and have, therefore, warranted symbolic struggles and power potential for making identities legitimate. The constant cooperation between symbols, communities and town spaces in the nation state has been contracted to the analytical figure of the town that remembers “top-down” through the practices of ritualising the memory validated by the official discourse and forgets “bottom-up” through resistance, mockery and destruction (real as well as ritual) of those memory sites.<sup>17</sup> If, however, we consider the town in terms of the border, i.e. from the point of view of the descendants of migrants, we shall recognize that the town has forgotten “top-down” through politics of national homogenization (both in Bulgaria and in Turkey) and is trying to remember “bottom-up” through rituals of recalling, or the return of descendants.

MOBILE MEMORIES, MOBILE PEOPLE:  
THE DESCENDANTS OF BULGARIANS FROM THRACE AND  
THEIR “RETURNS”

Tsarevo is a town of resettlers from Thrace and, in particular, from Strandzha Mountain. The inheritance of migration has been turned into cultural and symbolic capital due to the hard-line policies and the impermeable border with Turkey throughout the twentieth century. Constructing inheritance is directed towards a Bulgarian national history and national territory that would incorporate the re-settlement memories of the migrants and their descendants, their settling down and mapping memories onto the festive rituals – celebrating the Day of Thrace, im-

portant dates of the Thracian movement, gatherings, etc. Even though they live few kilometres away from the border and from the villages where their ancestors originated, the descendants cross the border only in order to maintain the memory of what has been and to dream of “going back” and finding “what has been lost”. The resettles, who came to Tsarevo after 1912, replaced the Turkish and Greek population and reshaped the town not only as architecture but as well as social organisation and cultural diversity.

## INSTITUTIONALISED DESCENDANTS AND HERITAGE

Among the social actors that legitimise the descendants institutionally are the local associations of Thracian Bulgarians in the towns and villages of the target area. Before World War II the associations were the main forms of a civil society at a local level, which organised the entire cultural and social life there: the activities of the culture houses (*chitalishta*), the annual feasts, the anniversaries, etc.

After 1944 the associations had a controversial fate as they became part of the political structures of the socialist society until they reached a point when their functioning was suspended; it was only resumed in the 1980s.

It was the fact that the associations were enlisted among the Fatherland Front (“*Otechestven front*”) members, a mass organisation politically subordinated to the Communist party, that blurred their specificity and lessened their influence on the local communities, while appearing as another form of the political power of the State in the socialist period. The Forest, Shipbuilding, Fishing, and Consumer cooperations, as well as the Culture house (“*Chitalishte*”)<sup>18</sup> set up by the Thracians when they settled in the town, turned Vasiliko into a new type of settlement, *Michurin*.<sup>19</sup> In the 1990s the associations struggled to find their place in the transforming Bulgarian society and inconsistently developed as a political organisation, on the one hand, while functioning as NGO’s, on the other hand, because those were the days of shaping up the structures of civil society anew.

Our interest in the associations today reflects this reality; they have recovered their legitimacy but because of the lack of generational continuity are in the process of establishing new forms of activity such as social networks that would need to mobilise various resources through the symbolical capital of heritage of Thracian Bulgarians.

Thus, the question of heritage is being researched by means of the repeated conversion of capital by the newer generations, strategies for converting symbolic into economic capital.

### MIGRATION AS A CULTURAL CAPITAL: EMBODIED HERITAGE AND CONTRADICTORY HEIRS

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, there was a generational change of the chairpersons of Thracian associations in the villages and towns in the Burgas region<sup>20</sup> but what has been defined as new activities is most often assistance in filling in declarations of owning properties in Turkey and the so called “excursions to the native lands,”<sup>21</sup> Edirne and Istanbul or the Strandzha villages near-by. Many youth associations were established as branches of the Union of Thracian Bulgarians. Apart from that they keep the institutionalised forms of celebrations and commemorations marked in the calendar of the Union of Thracian associations at a national level. It was very difficult for the descendants of Thracian Bulgarians, refugees from the Turkish part of Strandzha in the socialist period, to convert their cultural capital into economic one, and it gradually lost its symbolic value in the local dimensions of the villages and towns around Tsarevo. Local specificity is not significant and all villages look identical, whereas Strandzha is significant for the Bulgarian national topography as a “cradle of civilization,” because of its “distinctive folklore,” and in view of the “uniqueness of dancing on fire (nestinarstvo).”<sup>22</sup>

As the state border has been established, the symbolically significant centre is the capital and the interior of the country, whereas in terms of national space it seems that the only locals around Tsarevo, the so called “urgartsi,”<sup>23</sup> keepers of the local traditions and dances on fire, are more or less identifiable. These marks and categorisations, which were hidden from the publicity during the socialism started to be articulated in the urban management level and local political model of the municipality.

### OBJECTIFIED HERITAGE: TRANSFORMING THE IMAGINARY INTO A SOCIAL PRACTICE

After the visas were waived for Bulgarians visiting Turkey, one of the first tasks of the restored associations was to organise the “return to the native lands” for the third generation, who crossed the border by means

of a symbolic link, other people's recollections (their grandparents') and experience (the refugees'). This heritage is once again converted from cultural into economic capital; the descendants can sell the seaside properties that the refugees received as compensation from the state.

For the Thracian Bulgarians, with the political changes of 1989 and the waved restrictions on travelling, the first trips to the birthplaces of their ancestors in the Republic of Turkey start taking place in the form of tourist visits. The first chairperson of the recovered in 1990 Thracian Association in Tsarevo is also the first organiser of 15 visits to the native land. In order to illustrate the transformation of the symbolic return into a real (tourist) practice and the uses of the inheritance of migration, I shall quote her tale divided into two as it is: restoring the connection between the generations (dead and alive) through the ritual and establishing a link with the local people who settled in the houses of their ancestors:

1. Taking soil from the native land: circulation of the objects of inheritance, collective memory at work, and the return of the descendants:

The first trip was a familial trip. One person enlisted 12 others. Another one enlisted 15. Still another one enlisted ... and thus we had 50 people. 50 people were gathered and we hired a coach and a minibus and off we went to Turkey. We had to, then, go to the village of Georgi Kondolov, the chieftain, and collect soil from his native land. We wanted it to be from his home place but we never found out where the house was, no one could point it out. Therefore we asked where the church was and we collected soil from there for Georgi Kondolov's monument that was to be inaugurated here.<sup>24</sup> Then Solomon Pasi was foreign minister.<sup>25</sup> He came for the inauguration of the monument and laid a bullet shell filled with soil. (V.Y. ex-chair of the Thracian Association in Tsarevo, interview from 2011)

2. Recognising the inheritance – getting to know the “other” who inhabits the space of the ancestors:

But mayors in Turkish villages always respond. And when we ask after someone, about someone's house, that is, those are small settlements and they know which house belonged to whom and all the rest of it... When we go to one of those villages, we go to a caf ... cafe ... and they start asking questions, and we start asking questions and we gradually find out things about each other. They say ... we'll call the mayor, and when he comes, open-handed, treats us all to Turkish delight, treats us all to coffee – you see – they are hospitable! (V.Y. ex-chair of the Thracian Association in Tsarevo, interview from 2011)

The inheritance of the ancestors, the memory of migration and the real crossing of the border in search for the lost birthplaces is only possible when the border is open and settled people can once again follow moving objects – the narratives about migration, about the home place, about the square in the native village, the trauma of leaving and fleeing. This is a process of getting educated about inheritance and heirs (embodiment), “inherited by the inheritance,” successfully “appropriated it” in Bourdieu’s terms (Bourdieu, 1999: 508), in which the personal experience (familial, ancestral) is legitimized and objectified with a publicly acknowledged form as symbolic capital of the Thracian inheritance of the refugees. But these returns of the descendants are also a form of cross-border investment in social capital - getting to know the neighbour, who has settled in the old Bulgarian villages and is himself a migrant from the Balkans or from other parts of Turkey.<sup>26</sup> The memories bring back the knowledge of local history about the Bulgarians who lived there before.

Although the “homecoming” of the descendants to the border areas such as Strandzha is similar to the excursions organised by other Thracian associations,<sup>27</sup> this act of border crossing is also an act of investment into social capital. The mediators between the totally unfamiliar “home-comers” and those accommodated in the Bulgarian houses were the migrants from Bulgaria and the Balkans which settled on several waves during the last century. The opposite movement – the descendants of Turks and Muslims who have migrated from the region after the Balkan wars still cannot come and visit the birthplaces of their ancestors (as Turkish citizens they still need visas), but the Greeks are coming and participate in some local feasts in the villages of their origins in Bulgaria nowadays.

## PROJECTS FOR TRANSBORDER COLLABORATION – INSTITUTIONALISING (COMMON) THRACIAN HERITAGE

### Tsarevo and the Border

The strategies of the descendants of Thracians from Tsarevo and the region in the direction of Strandzha and Edirne are already part of the official local policies of the municipality. Under the legitimate form of projects for transborder collaboration, once the crossing of the border was eased and Bulgarians were allowed to travel freely to the Republic of

Turkey, in addition to the trips to the villages, a number of projects for cultural exchange gained popularity. The active party in applications with projects for transborder collaboration is the Turkish party and, in the beginning, projects were developed thanks to the personal contacts of social actors on both sides of the border. The key actor there is a migrant from Bulgaria, who works with the neighbour municipality of Pinarhissar.

The most popular projects are those seeking collaboration in sports or aiming at the shared awareness and appreciation of Thracian culture on both side of the Bulgarian-Turkish border: folklore, cuisine, or style of life. These projects predominantly involve children from Tsarevo and Pinarhissar and their activities remain within the framework of their respective schools and the outreach activities organised by those schools; the programmes for pupils' mobility are exchange programmes, in which Turkish children stay with Bulgarian families and vice versa; as a result, some of these contacts are maintained after the actual visit, either by using the internet or by making private trips later on.

At municipality level, there is the project for transborder collaboration on building a Thracian settlement that would represent the style of life in the Strandzha region, as a follow-up of the "Representing the Life Style of the Strandzha Region" project.

### Edirne and the Border

Up to the beginning of the twentieth century Edirne was one of the most important town centres in the region of Thrace. After the Balkan Wars, it gradually lost its centrality and became more of a peripheral town due to its proximity to the Bulgarian and the Greek borders. In the 1990s, the town once again welcomed migrants from the Balkans, which had an impact on its structure and on the different groups that started inhabiting town spaces and introducing different cultural models, mainly from Bulgaria and the former Yugoslavian republics. On the other hand, Edirne is important for Bulgarians not simply because it accommodates migrants from the country, but also due to the large Bulgarian community to be found in it before the Balkan wars – nowadays it is reduced to just a few members. It is intriguing to map out in what ways Bulgaria is present in the contemporary Turkish town, how Bulgarian traces have turned into aspects of town heritage, to what an extent they are legiti-

mate in public space, which are the places where descendants return and tourists visit.

Apart from the residential areas with migrants from Bulgaria, Edirne has two Bulgarian churches reconstructed – St. Georgi<sup>28</sup> and Saints Konstantin and Elena.<sup>29</sup> These are the two most frequently visited sites by both the “expeditions of descendants” and the organised tourist groups that visit the town for a day on their way back from Istanbul.

Restoring the importance of the Bulgarian traces in Edirne’s town space is only possible as a result of the changed status of the border and the relations between the neighbour states, the cooperation between state institutions such as ministries of culture, but also thanks to the municipal administration of the town and its residents, who are often in the role of tourist guides for the visitors. Notable Christian celebrations gather official guests and tourists from Bulgaria, representatives of the local authorities, intellectuals, students of Bulgarian language at the Thracian University, and people from the neighbourhood, who share the food and the cheer in the church yard. Other heritage sites reminiscent of the old Bulgarian community in Edirne are the Boys’ School named after Dr. Peter Beron, the Bulgarian cemetery, the monuments signifying the Balkan wars and the Treaty of Lausanne, but they are not part of the tours organised by tourist companies as yet.

In terms of administration and of residents, who are descendants of migrants and have their own memories of the birthplaces of their ancestors somewhere in the Balkans, the town of Edirne started utilizing this diversity to construct its identity as a border town in the 1990s – identifying itself as a beginning, not as an end or a periphery. Despite the dynamic political relations between Greece and Turkey and Bulgaria, there is a tendency to exhibit the shared heritage of Thrace via the policies of the local and the central governments and with the help of projects.

#### Edirne, the border and project culture: constructing heritage

If we change our vantage point and consider the town from the border, the hypothesis that the status of Edirne has been changing becomes viable: from the point of view of managing the cultural and historical heritage, the town is becoming less of a peripheral (with reference to the capital) settlement, preoccupied with activities of localisation<sup>30</sup> and crossing the border, and more of a place expressive of its own specific locality through project activities validating the national and Ottoman cultural

and historical heritage while relying on universal values. The most significant object is the Selimiye mosque, included in the World heritage list of UNESCO.

The issue of the three states constructing their share of the Thracian heritage and the meanings invested in it from the point of view of regionalisation and the reconstruction of the symbolic historical territory, Thrace, is most intriguing.<sup>31</sup> Due to the Bulgarian sensitivity to the difference between the types of heritage and their legitimate heirs, constructed by such cultural capital, there is a distinction between ancient Thracians and contemporary Thracians expressed by the two words used to denote them (“traki” and “trakiytsi”); this distinction has been blurred in everyday speech in contemporary Turkey despite the fact that the language keeps the different meanings.<sup>32</sup>

On the occasion of the centenary of the Balkan wars, a project for the construction of a tower has been developed; the tower is meant to be close to the border between the three states and high enough to allow a view of the entire territory of Thrace.

Another idea for a collaborative project means to exemplify the shared style of life in the region:

Yes, we had this other idea to make another Bulgarian-Turkish complex and seemingly everything was completed, right? The Bulgarian party told us, no, we have no financial resources. To make a Bulgarian-Turkish centre here. With lakes, with everything, two houses will be built: a Revival-type house and this other one, in the one there will be Turkish dishes, local food, right? In two restaurants here, right? Cafeterias Bulgarian style, cafeterias Turkish style, right? Turkish coffee, what we have here. (From an interview from H. Ch., 2011)

The projects and programmes for transborder collaboration that the Edirne municipality takes part in are numerous and most of them are directed towards getting to know the culture and the communities on both sides of the border and towards exhibiting that cultural heritage. Most often these are projects focusing on the shared cuisine on both sides of the border with visiting culinary exhibitions, food degustation, exchange of artistic events, travelling fairs of craftsmanship that take place in Edirne and in Plovdiv, concerts, theatrical performances, etc.

What is important for the construction of the town close to the border and across the border are some of the forms of institutional presence of Bulgaria: not the tourist sites and places of pilgrimage, but those that or-

ganise everyday life for the local migrants and their descendants. One of the consulates of Bulgaria in Turkey is situated in Edirne, which accommodates and legitimises the community of Bulgarian citizens (predominantly ethnic Turks with dual citizenship) in the Thracian part of Turkey. Most of the events in the town, related to the cultural and economic links between the two countries, are carried out with the support of the consulate.

#### Edirne urban public space, moving heritage and festive life

The cultural heritage of the “others” that is accepted by the majority has its institutionalised form – the festivals and public events and its spaces – central urban places as well as some other places in the newly built part of Edirne – the neighbourhoods. The articulation of the heritage of the Balkans is the folklore and material culture. But the entire organisation of these cultural exchanges is also a work of investment in social capital and using social networks before and after resettlements of population in the region. The most frequent mobility and visits are those of children on the school age.

One of the institutionalised forms of transborder exchange is the Week of children and youth in Turkey, which precedes Children’s Day (23rd April). In the festivals organised in this period, there are a lot of children’s groups from neighbouring Balkan and other European countries that take part.

These events and the exchanged visits of children from Bulgaria in Turkey and vice versa are a legitimate form of “intercultural dialogues,” “transborder collaboration” and mutual getting to know each other, encouraged by the EU. In this political framework, nevertheless, the local forms of regional communities come to the limelight, at the level of towns. According to the requirements of the Comenius programme,<sup>33</sup> which frequently finances projects about similar transborder collaboration and exchange of visits between groups from Bulgaria and Turkey, the host country has to provide for the children’s stay. In Edirne, Bulgarian children are often accommodated with the families of migrants from Bulgaria “in order to reduce the stress of culture shock caused by the unfamiliar language and surroundings in everyday life” (in the phrase of R.K., a headmaster in 2010). The migrants from Bulgaria to Edirne are in the situation of translators of culture and institutions.

I had Bulgarian children from a village near Varna a couple of times [possibly as part of the projects with the Valchi dol school, M.Z.'s note]. Then I got a phone call the year after; they had my phone, the parents; the children were happy with their visit and wanted to come again. They used to come for 4-5 days for this festival. They come on 21st and 22nd of April and stay for four or five days. Last night my son went to that school and said that they had been waiting for the visitors. (From an interview with R.K. 2010)

The programs for student exchange and artists' mobility, as well as the festivals in Edirne, are the active channel of transborder collaboration. In this sense, the Thrace region is reconstructed in terms of urban space presence through the guest groups from the Bulgarian part of the historical territory: Yambol, Sliven, Burgas, Aytos, Karnobat, etc.

## CONCLUSION

The official results from this type of transborder cooperation include an exchange of ideas and getting to know the other, the neighbour; discovering the similarities in folklore, in cuisine, in the style of life; recovering a shared habitation of the same territory in a distant period of history. Through this official form of mobile heritage (project culture, festivals, official visits, and expeditions back to the native land) inheriting migration acquires a new meaning for the descendants – they no longer see it only as a traumatic memory, personal and/ or family drama, related to being forced to flee from one's birthplace and settle in a new context. The change of status of the forbidden border into a crossable border and the actual crossing abroad legitimizes in new ways that heritage as symbolic capital and allows it to be converted into social and economic capital. At the beginning of the text I phrased the hypothesis that the inheritance of migration is inheriting liminality – social, cultural, and political. The forbidden border and the settling of people steers the efforts of the generations of descendants towards better integration in the new context, acquiring new experience, unlike that of the ancestors, because the economic and the social capital has remained on the other side of the border where no inheriting can take place. The descendants come into possession of the cultural capital – the stories and memories, the identity of knowing who you are and where your ancestors come from. The policy of homogenizing the population reinforced by the socialist regime in Bulgaria unifies the differences by guiding people's biographical strate-

gies into investing a different type of social capital typical of the socialist society. Despite this tendency, amongst the first tourists and discoverers of the neighbouring country on the other side of the border were those borderline people, descendants of the Thracian Bulgarians, who, with no direct experience in crossing the border, go back to ritualise memory, draw the symbolic territory of inheritance, map out the “Bulgarian traces,” and lend meaning to places in Turkey and Greece that do not coincide with the touristic heritage sites that these countries offer. The first trips of the descendants and their initial social contacts pave the way for developing tourism, projects for cross-border cooperation, festivals, and business initiatives, while the mutual getting to know one another is institutionalised as political moves of the two states in the process of recognising and acknowledging the heritage of the “other”. The other group of borderline people are the Turks, who migrated from socialist Bulgaria in 1989 and got integrated in Turkish society but still kept their links with their birthplaces, and when the possibility presented itself (after the year 2000) they applied for dual citizenship and got it; they have a life organised around associations and keep up social networks of relatives or neighbours from Bulgaria. Although the last mass wave is relatively new migration (twenty-five years ago), a process of patrimonialisation of the inheritance of resettling can be traced in the commemoration practices, celebrations, returns (even though still private trips), keeping up links with Bulgaria, taking part in political life, etc.

This case of reinterpretation of the inheritance of migration from the point of view of the dynamic Bulgarian-Turkish border shows some general tendencies of global mobility, even though with elements of the local historicity of the two Balkan states. National collective ideological narratives are underlying the construction of identities of the two groups in the respective states – as Bulgarian and as Turkish, who have “come back” to their “homeland,” where they are a majority and whose homogeneity is “guarded” by the impermeable state border – these narratives are problematised by the mobile people, who follow the memories of migration and cross the border, get to know the other, discover similarities or differences. Reconsidering the border revalorises the inheritance of heirs and migrants. And because inheritance and inheriting are mechanisms of constructing identities and communities through expressing symbols, emblems, and signs in the global epoch of multiple narratives, it is the liminality of this type of moving objects that makes them easily

recognisable; no additional efforts are required to translate culture and valorise, and it is easy to utilize in the tourist industry and the new mobilities. Even if at the very beginning of this process, Bulgaria displays tendencies of constructing this type of mobile heritage and movement of people towards the neighbour states – the rudimentary beginnings of tourist pilgrimage, simultaneously part of a post-modern mobility and of strengthening the local via global signs, symbols and heritage.

References:

- Althabe, Gérard. *Investigations ethnologiques appliquées aux phénomènes urbains: rapports sociaux dans l'espace résidentiel et processus d'insertion*. Paris: EHESS. 1983.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso. 1983.
- Bokova, Irena. “Granitsi, mobilnost i rekonstruirane na teritorii.” *Sotsiologicheski problemi. Bulgarski i Balkanski migratsii i mobilnosti* 1-2 (2012): 172–185.
- Bokova, Irena. “Podvizhniyat chovek” – v mrezhata ot toposi. *Antropologichni izsledvaniya* vol. 4 (2003): 78–98. Ed. Pl. Bochkov. Sofia: New Bulgarian University/Yar Publishing House.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. “Contradictions of inheritance.” *The Weight of the World. Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*. Eds. Pierre Bourdieu et al. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1999. 507–513.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. “The forms of capital.” *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Ed. J. Richardson. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986. 241–258.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Le sens pratique*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1980.
- Elchinova, Magdalena. “Alien by Default: The Identity of the Turks of Bulgaria at Home and in Immigration.” *Developing Cultural Identity in the Balkans: Convergence vs. Divergence*. Brussels: P.I.E. – Peter Lang, 2005. 67–110.
- Elchinova, Magdalena. “Border and Categorization: the Case of the 1989 Bulgarian Re-settlers in Turkey.” *Migration, Memory, Heritage: Socio-cultural Approaches to the Bulgarian-Turkish Border*. Eds. Valentina Ganeva-Raycheva, Meglena Zlatkova. Sofia: IEFSEM–BAS, 2012. 12–29.
- Ganeva-Raycheva, Valentina. “Migration, Memory, Heritage: the Example of the Thrace Bulgarians, Descendants of Refugees and Resettlers from Eastern Thrace.” *Bulgarian Folklore* 5 (2011, special edition): 48–66.
- Ganeva-Raycheva, Valentina. “Migration, territories, heritage: discourses and practices in constructing the Bulgarian-Turkish border.” *Migration, Memory, Heritage: Socio-cultural Approaches to the Bulgarian-Turkish Border*. Eds. Valentina Ganeva-Raycheva, Meglena Zlatkova. Sofia: IEFSEM – BAS, 2012. 29–62. <http://2sidesborder.org/migration%20EN/index.html>
- Givre, Olivier. 2012. “Patrimoines habitées.” *Lokalno nasledstvo – resurs za mestno razvitiie*. Plovdiv: CAESS – University of Plovdiv, 2012. 45–59.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *The Collective Memory*. New York: Harper & Row. 1980.

- Maeva, Mila. *Bulgarskite turtsi – preselnitsi v Republika Turtsiya (Kultura i identichnost)*. Sofia: IMIR. 2006.
- Marcus, George. “Ethnography in/of the world system: the emergence of multi-sited ethnography.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24 (1995): 95–117.
- Nora, Pierre. “Mémoire collective.” *La nouvelle histoire*. Coord. Jacques Le Goff. Paris: Retz. 1978. 398–401.
- Parla, Aise. “Longing, Belonging, and Locations of Homeland among Turkish Immigrants from Bulgaria.” *Journal of Southeastern Europe and Black Sea Studies* 6 (4) (2006): 543–557.
- Penkova, Stoyka. “Contradictions of Inheritance on Both Sides of the Bulgarian-Turkish Border: Socioanalysis and Discursive Practices.” *Migration, Memory, Heritage: Socio-cultural Approaches to the Bulgarian-Turkish Border*. Eds. Valentina Ganeva-Raycheva and Meglena Zlatkova. Sofia: IEFSEM – BAS, 2012. 99–133. <http://2sidesborder.org/migration%20EN/index.html>
- Rashkova, Natalia “Ritualisation of Familial Memory. Revisiting the Birthplaces of Refugees from Eastern Thrace.” *Migration, Memory, Heritage: Socio-cultural Approaches to the Bulgarian-Turkish Border*. Eds. Valentina Ganeva-Raycheva and Meglena Zlatkova. Sofia: IEFSEM – BAS, 2012. 167–173.
- Tarrius, Alain. *Anthropologie du mouvement*. Orléans: Paradigme. 1989.
- Todorova, Maria. *Introduction: Learning Memory, Remembering Identity, M. Balkan Identities, Nation and Memory*. Ed. Maria Todorova. New York: New York University Press. 2004. 1–24.
- Vukov, Nikolai. “Resettlements, memory and commemorative returns: the noting the “revival” process in Bulgaria and the politics of memory.” *Migration, Memory, Heritage: Socio-cultural Approaches to the Bulgarian-Turkish Border*. Eds. Valentina Ganeva-Raycheva and Meglena Zlatkova. Sofia: IEFSEM – BAS, 2012. 137–150.
- Zlatkova, Meglena. “Inhabiting Divided Territories: ‘Coming home’ and ‘Returning in the Homeland’. Heirs and Rituals on the two sides of Bulgarian-Turkish Border.” *The Ritual Year 8. Migrations. The Yearbook of the SIEF Working Group on The Ritual Year*. Eds. D. Parusheva and L. Gergova. Sofia: IEFSEM-BAS, 2014. 142–161.
- Zlatkova, Meglena. “The Urban Palimpsest, or How to Study Cities in Transition: On a Possible Ethnosociological Approach in Urban Studies.” *Readings in the History and Culture of the Balkans in Support of University Teaching*. Ed. Margarita Karamihova. Sofia: Paradigma Publishing House, 2011. 271–284.
- Zlatkova, Meglena. “Towns Close to the Border: Spaces of Migration and Heritage. The cases of Edirne, Turkey and Tsarevo, Bulgaria.” *Migration, Memory, Heritage: Socio-cultural Approaches to the Bulgarian-Turkish Border*. Eds. Valentina Ganeva-Raycheva and Meglena Zlatkova. Sofia: IEFSEM – BAS, 2012. 137–150.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> In Bulgarian there is one word that encompasses the three meanings, *nasledstvo*.

<sup>2</sup> UNESCO's 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/convention>.

<sup>3</sup> The larger context of this point of view is a research project "Resettlers and Migrants on Two Sides of The Bulgarian-Turkish Border: Heritage, Identity, Intercultural Interactions," funded by the National Science Fund, Bulgaria. [http://2sidesborder.org/index\\_en.html](http://2sidesborder.org/index_en.html).

<sup>4</sup> More about the methodology see in Zlatkova 2011.

<sup>5</sup> The so-called "Thracian refugees" or Bulgarians from the Eastern part of the Thrace region with their heirs are approximately 800 000 nowadays. After the Angora agreement of 1925, the population considered Bulgarian were pressed to leave Turkey within a very short period of time. Crossing the border in the opposite direction – from Bulgaria to Turkey – includes several waves throughout the twentieth century – in the interwar period, after WW2, in the 1960s and in the 1970s – the so called migration to bring families together. The most significant waves for this research here are the so-called "Big excursion" in 1989 and the migration of the 1990s perceived as economic. The Conventions and agreements for out-migrants between Bulgaria and Turkey are the following: the Istanbul Convention (1909), the Agreement for emigration of Bulgarian citizens with Turkish origin whose families have migrated to Turkey before 1952 (1968), the Additional protocol of the agreement for migrations between Turkey and Bulgaria (Ankara 1977), The International passports Law (May, 1989).

<sup>6</sup> The ways of crossing the border and the official figures in statistics are analysed from the point of view of migration from Bulgaria to Turkey by Aise Parla (Parla 2006).

<sup>7</sup> Border problems as a complex social construction of the Bulgarian Turks who have resettled in Turkey are analysed by Magdalena Elchinova (2012).

<sup>8</sup> Unlike former colonies and colonial powers, the contemporary Balkan states inherited the Ottoman Empire, which was a territory of circulation. After having the borders of the new nation states fixed, the state authorities regulated and directed the streams of people who were crossing the new national territories, and resorted to bio-politics and policies of constructing memory and identity meant to localize them as settled people – i.e. citizens. (Todorova, 2004)

<sup>9</sup> More about symbolical transgressions of the forbidden border see in Zlatkova 2014.

<sup>10</sup> A detailed analysis of the politics of memory, commemoration practices, and the Union of Thracian Bulgarians is offered by Valentina Ganeva-Raycheva (2012).

<sup>11</sup> More about the "Revival process" and the migration of Turks, called re-settlers to Turkey see Maeva, 2006, Elchinova, 2005, 2012.

<sup>12</sup> The politics of memory related to the resettlement of the Bulgarian Turks is analysed by Nikolay Vukov. He "outlines some of the aspects of this type of visits in the recent years and interprets them as a kind of travel through space and time, which reveals both the divergent trajectories of remembering about the "Revival" process, and the specific duality of the resettlers – as having returned to their native

places to commemorate the events that had actually led to their resettlement.” (Vukov, 2012: 138).

<sup>13</sup> For example, *Trakia* Association for culture and solidarity of the Balkan Turks and the Federation of the Turks from Rumelia and the Balkans, both are based at Edirne.

<sup>14</sup> After Benedict Anderson’s (1983) model of “imagined communities.”

<sup>15</sup> There is a substantial corpus of research materials and interpretations on collective memory and the sites of memory, as well as on rewriting history. The authors, who postulate the tradition in this intellectual field of Contemporary history and define the terms we now use, are Maurice Halbwachs (1980) and Pierre Nora (1978).

<sup>16</sup> The mouth of the Rezovo River is the farthest boundary of Bulgarian territory. Although the village of Rezovo is on the border, there is no border checkpoint there. The nearest checkpoint is at Malko Tarnovo, some 50 km away from Tsarevo.

<sup>17</sup> On the rituals performed by the two target groups in order to remember and reconstruct spaces and territories, see Raycheva 2011, 2012, Vukov 2012.

<sup>18</sup> The Georgi Kondolov Culture House – 1912.

<sup>19</sup> The town had the name Vasiliko up to 1934, when it was re-named Tsarevo, a Bulgarian translation of the Greek name. From 1950 up to 1991 the socialist town was called Michurin, after a famous Soviet biologist. Thereafter, up to the present, it has been Tsarevo again.

<sup>20</sup> The municipality of Tsarevo and the surrounding areas are part of the Burgas region.

<sup>21</sup> In-depth research and participant observation are carried out by Valentina Ganeva-Raycheva and Natalia Rashkova in the framework of the current research project. For more details, see Raicheva 2012, Rashkova 2012.

<sup>22</sup> The dance is listed by UNESCO as intangible cultural heritage.

<sup>23</sup> These are the residents of the Bulgari village, formerly called Urgari.

<sup>24</sup> The memorialisation of the Thracian heritage as an element of the townscape of Tsarevo is marked by the monuments of Georgi Kondolov at the central square and of Mihail Gerdzhikov in the park by the sea. The specific ritual of carrying soil over from the birthplace to the grave or to the monument of the deceased ancestors is the major goal of each one of the expeditions.

<sup>25</sup> Solomon Pasi was the country’s foreign minister, who signed the agreement for Bulgaria to join the EU on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2007.

<sup>26</sup> In the villages occupied by Bulgarians, once the exchange of population took place, it was Muslims from the Balkan Peninsula that settled there: from Bosnia, Kosovo, Macedonia, etc., along with families from the interior of Turkey. They remember that Bulgarians lived there once but due to the many years of political dividedness of the territory they do not know their neighbours on the other side of the border.

<sup>27</sup> The Associations are part of the Union of Thracian associations – a national organisation of the descendants of the studied group.

<sup>28</sup> The church was restored as part of the international Programme for the preservation of the immovable cultural heritage with finances of the Directorate of Religions at the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Bulgaria and it was sanctified in 2004.

<sup>29</sup> The church was restored as part of the same programme and was opened and sanctified in 2009. 2010 saw a monument of the Bulgarian patriarch Antim I in the church yard – its inauguration was honoured by representatives of the Thracian Association of Tsarevo, Bulgaria.

<sup>30</sup> One of the ideas for town development relies on Edirne, which has been the historical centre of the Thrace region, resuming its status with the help of numerous projects; one project in particular has adopted the goal of opening a tax-free mall on an island on the Maritsa river, another one is centred around the Thrace Euro-region, still another one is focused on the Strandzha Euroregion, and so on and so forth.

<sup>31</sup> Detailed projects for the reconstruction of the cultural and historical heritage, i.e. Thracian houses meant to exemplify the style of life of the Thracians, are being developed in the Tsarevo municipality. Irena Bokova has analysed some of the projects related to the Thrace region in the Greek municipalities by the border (Bokova, 2012).

<sup>32</sup> In the Turkish language there is a word for the Thracians of ancient times (traklar) and Thracians as the regional belonging of the contemporary population in the region (trakylilar). For more details, see <http://tdkterim.gov.tr/bts/>

<sup>33</sup> Comenius programme: [http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/comenius\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/comenius_en.htm).