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The Athens 2004 Olympic Games was seen as an opportunity to “Europeanise” and modernise the Greek capital. However, the works materialised for their preparation significantly altered the urban geography of the city, whilst also enabling for the gradual imposition of neoliberal governance and schemes that still affect Athens today. The reconfigurations enforced upon the urban landscape and its population saw the rise of residential activism and the persistent reclamation of public spaces, significantly increase with the eruption of the economic crisis in 2008 and the 2011 Syntagma Square Occupation.

The archaeological sites of Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy have featured prominently in these reclamations by residential movements, as the ripples of neoliberal policies continue to threaten residents’ uses of and engagements with these spaces. The particular archaeological sites maintain a dual function; they are considered spaces of archaeological significance whilst also operating as parks for recreational uses. They thus present unique cases of open, public spaces within the Athenian urban environment containing archaeological remnants, fully integrated into the daily lives of local communities.

An additional issue affecting the communities’ interaction with the archaeological sites are the efforts to monumentalise spaces and limit their use by local communities—such as in the case of Philopappou—or the lack of attention due to the location of sites in ‘degraded’ areas, as in the case of Plato’s Academy. As such, residential activists most prominently fight for the protection of these spaces from capitalist endeavours as well as the archaeological practices still catalysed by colonialist modes of operation.

Through the use of archaeological ethnography, this research explores the modern cultural biographies of the spaces of interest through the extra-official activities of the local residents, their ‘unofficial’ heritage discourses, and their residential activism in their efforts to claim their right to be a part of the decision-making processes which affect the protection and future of the spaces. It reveals the modern significations and meanings attributed to archaeological sites by the people experiencing them in their daily lives, the ways in which they have redefined the spaces in the present, and the need to decolonise and re-evaluate archaeological practices.
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Chapter 1  Introduction

In November 2008—a little over a year after having completed my MA in Mediterranean Archaeology at the University of Bristol—I had returned to my hometown of Athens and I was working as a Statistics Inspector for the Insurance Organisation of Freelance Professionals as part of the Manpower Employment Organisation’s Work Experience Acquisition Programme. In other words, I was nowhere near my dream of becoming a practising archaeologist. A brewing debt crisis, lack of funding in the cultural sector, and debilitating bureaucracy were just a few of the many reasons I had ended up working where I did. To be honest, I had been warned repeatedly about not entering my chosen field of study: “You will never find a job!” or, “Why don’t you study something that’s more practical?” and of course, my personal favourite: “…What else is there to find?”

Aside from the fact that there was definitely a lot more to find, there were perhaps even more things to re-discover, and embarking on this thesis was the way for me to do that.

Explaining what it is I am researching has usually one of two reactions. The first one being: “That is really interesting, you should speak to... they were a member of the X initiative…”, whereas the second reaction typically involves a perplexed look, followed by: “Oh, so you’re not digging somewhere?” and sometimes, people want to make sure their hearing is intact: “I thought you said you were studying archaeology?”

So, this thesis is by no means a conventional archaeological endeavour, involving excavations and the unearthing of artifacts; what it does involve is a lot of discussions with members of residential movements and initiatives, as well as re-discovering archaeological sites in my hometown from a new perspective. It deals with the intricate relationship between urban local communities and archaeological sites in Athens at a time of social, political and economic crisis. It focuses on the daily use of these particular spaces, as well as the activism demonstrated by residents’ associations and activists in their efforts to protect and re-appropriate archaeological sites against a variety of odds. These odds most prominently include the Greek Archaeological Service as well as the ongoing neoliberal governance and reconfiguration of the city.

My thesis critically investigates the multifaceted contemporary engagements, narratives, and significations attributed to sites by local residents, which—despite constituting the modern cultural biography of sites—are ignored and dismissed due to their extra-official nature. It is centred on archaeological sites that are open to the public and are actively a part of the everyday lives of local residents in Athens. However, as opposed to ‘mega-sites’ such as the Acropolis, these sites either receive minimal/partial attention by state services or are exposed to commercial exploitation. As
such, my research explores the extra-official contemporary heritage discourses existing in these spaces, as well as the issues emerging between residential movements and state services due to sites’ contested management. The term ‘extra-official’ is employed in this study to denote the activities that go beyond standardised interactions and practices visitors usually engage in when visiting archaeological sites.

Eleni Tzirtzilaki, activist/artist/architect and friend, best sums up the essence of this research in an excerpt from our interview in November 2015:

“I don’t believe in the illusion that alternative narratives can be integrated with official ones anymore. I lost that hope when they [the Greek Archaeological Service] destroyed our community garden. That was the day I realised there is absolutely no way that what I do, and what so many other people do at this moment in time, would ever be part of an official narrative. We will always be considered ‘the other’, standing on the opposite side... Capitalism would very much like to silence these alternative narratives... But our stories will not be forgotten... we are making sure that they will not be. We record our experiences, we take care of that.”

(Tzirtzilaki, personal communication, 5/11/2015)

---

1 Community Garden in an inactive archaeological space on Asomaton Street, Athens. The creation of the garden was part of the ‘Urban Voids’ project by the Nomadic Architecture Network (for more information, see: http://nomadikiarxitektoniki.net/en/texts-en/urban-voids/). [Last Accessed: 12/09/2018]. See also Hamilakis 2017.
The aim of this research is threefold. First, its ethnographic nature aims to create a record of the modern social lives of the spaces of interest. As such, it intends to contribute to their multitemporal development in time, particularly through the local communities’ extra-official activities and narratives. Second, an important objective of this study is to contribute to the practical questions regarding managing heritage in Greece, re-evaluating and decolonising the archaeological practice and making it more accessible to the public. As such, it presents the need and urgency for the application of systematic community/public archaeological practices, particularly within urban contexts. Last, this thesis aims to highlight the importance of the right to the city—being able to participate in its production through expression, interaction, and inclusion.

1.1 Themes/Research Questions

The following themes and questions have guided my investigation and are present throughout my work; they constitute the theoretical and methodological backbone of this thesis, through which I approach the archaeological sites and local communities of interest. These themes and questions should not be seen as separate, but rather as intersecting entities.

1.1.1 Temporality/Modern Cultural Biography of Spaces

The archaeological sites of Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy are open and accessible to the public at all hours of the day. Beyond their status as archaeological sites, the spaces function as recreational parks encompassing diverse social activities which encapsulate their multiple temporalities and materialities. The interactions and engagements with these parks are of great interest, as they represent some of the few spaces in Greece where archaeological sites maintain a dual function: that of a site but also of a recreational park. The immediate contact with these spaces on a daily basis provides the opportunity for the creation of a modern cultural biography, through the residents’ extra-official heritage discourses. With this in mind, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

- What type of contact do local communities have with archaeological sites, and how do these influence the way they interact with and perceive sites? How are the parks incorporated in residents’ everyday lives?
- How have official archaeological practices affected local residents’ interaction with and perception of archaeological sites?

1.1.2 Clashes/Residential Activism

Urban activism has changed considerably in the last twenty years—both on a global and a local scale—varying from the issues that are being addressed to the ways that they are dealt and handled with. Residential movements operating throughout Athens have developed additional networks
amongst individuals, collectives, neighbourhoods and other movements, as well as different tactics to fight against an array of social, political, economic and environmental injustices. Neoliberal governance and policies have prompted these movements to reclaim their right to the city in diverse and creative ways. A prominent cause for which residential movements mobilise for is the reclamation of public space. As such, this thesis asks:

- How have archaeological sites operated within this context?
- In what ways has residential mobilisation facilitated contact between local communities and archaeological spaces?
- How have official practices, narratives, and state bureaucracy impeded a dialogical relationship between local communities and state services?

1.1.3 Politics of Identity

Exclusive state authority of archaeological heritage in Greece has created a substantial gap between the ancient past and contemporary Greek society. The disciplinary practices of the Archaeological Service have in many ways alienated and distanced the public, prompting issues on matters concerning ethics, ownership and stewardship. Much has been written about the ideological foundations of the Greek Archaeological Service that have shaped and moulded official archaeological narratives since its creation in the mid-nineteenth century. To a great extent, this involves the imposition of an overarching national narrative that simultaneously promotes and overshadows historical and archaeological pasts selectively. The visible and tangible remnants of the past, which act as evidence of the nation’s legitimacy, are the first ones to be ‘tended’ to, often employed to serve political/nationalist agendas. In the case of the urban, historically multi-temporal Athenian context, this imposed narrative provides a distinctive paradigm for the discrepancy existing between national and local identity. Therefore, this research asks:

- How have the systematic practices of exclusion the movements are subjected to by state services contributed to their identification with the spaces of interest?
- How have extra-official forms of contact contributed to the formation of local identity?
- How do these communities redefine the specific archaeological sites, and how does their perception of what a site is differ from the official one?

1.2 Research Background

How easy is it to provide a comprehensive research background for a subject that involves the correlation of a diverse set of themes, events and sociopolitical milieus? This section is a brief overview of the key chronological references which act as timemarks of this research, and which most effectively illuminate the development of archaeology as a discipline in Greece, the impact of
the social and urban reconfiguration of the city, and the increase of residential mobilisation in recent years.

1.2.1 The Ghost of Archaeology Past

The eighteenth and nineteenth century saw the formation of a number of European nation-states. One of the many factors underlining the emergence of these was the use of the past to secure sovereignty and legitimacy (Anderson 2006; Diaz-Andreu 2007). These newly formed states regarded antiquities situated in their lands as evidence which connected them to a pre-modern past, providing material and intangible evidence of their existence and cohesive longevity and most importantly, a sense of connection and continuity from antiquity to the present (Kohl and Fawcett 1995: 9). This was also the case for the creation of the Greek state. The Greek War of Independence of 1821 which marked the gradual emancipation from Ottoman rule, was a revolution motivated by western Enlightenment, which in turn had derived many of its sociopolitical ideals and ideologies from the Greek (mainly classical) past (Hamilakis 2007a: 103; Skopetea 1998: 35, 209-211). This pre-existing fascination with the classical past to a great extent determined the way the Greek nation-state was formed and imagined itself in the mid-nineteenth century (Lowental 1998; Hamilakis and Yalouri 1996: 121-122; Hamilakis 2007a: 57-123).

Similarly to many other European states, it was the elite that facilitated the importation of western ideals to Greece, and “accepting the European glorification of ancient Greece as essential to their own identity” (Strouliia and Buck Sutton 2010: 10); this, of course, was enabled by the existence and abundance of archaeological remnants throughout the country. The establishment of the Greek Archaeological Service during this time was therefore considered of upmost importance for the conservation of the Greek cultural capital, enabling thus the formation of a close relationship between the state and archaeology (Skopetea 1988: 197). Nevertheless, the externally derived notion of Western Hellenism—imposed by both Western European and Greek intellectuals— and the existing, internally constructed identity and reality of the people living within the occupied lands, created a collision between these two competing identities. Inevitably, these competing identities, combined with the role of the Greek Archaeological Service, ultimately provided the building blocks of a modern Greek identity and national consciousness. The creation and simultaneous development of the nation-state and of the Greek Archaeological Service in the mid-nineteenth century provide the historical background and broader context of this research; they inform the effects of the convergence of the two on archaeological discourse, practice, and public engagement with archaeological heritage today.
Figure 1.2 Graffiti in Koukaki District (2015).

1.2.2 Athens 2004: In the True Spirit of the Games

A key chronological reference which acts as a timemark of this research are the preparations for the Athens 2004 Olympic Games. The ideological significance of the Olympics in Greek society has been extensively discussed by a number of academics (Kitroeff 2004 and 2006; Llewllyn-Smith 2004; Panagiotopoulou 2008), revealing its central role in the link between the past and the present in national imagination. Kitroeff (2006: 214-15) argues that the Greeks consider the Olympics as a “form of continuity”, a sense that is not understood in “biological or literal terms” but rather in a more symbolic way—directly related to the modern Greeks’ shared language and geographical space with the ancients. Kitroeff (ibid.) thus considers the Olympics a “cornerstone of Greek identity”, almost a tangible association between antiquity and the present. The Games also function as a means through which Greece views itself as “an integral part of the West and of the community of nations worldwide” (ibid.), hence fostering both an internal sense of national identity whilst simultaneously shaping an external one for outward consumption.

Despite the heavily charged ideological significance of the Games, Panagiotopoulou (2014: 173) asserts that the majority of the population was not familiar with the prospective economic obligations and consequences of the 2004 Olympics. The preparations required infrastructural
modifications to be imposed and complex organisational tasks in order to satisfy the hosting of such an event. The Olympic Games brought a number of urban re-developments which decisively altered urban infrastructure in order to accommodate incoming tourists and global investors, disregarding the needs of local residents (i.e. housing, infrastructure, or social) (Arampatzi and Nicholls 2012). In addition, the works commenced the state’s gradual implementation of neoliberal policies resulting in the physical reshaping and social reconfiguration of the city (Portaliou 2008, Leontidou et al. 2007), affecting thus both its urban structure and geography. The public-private partnerships that carried out these urban projects resulted in the establishment of large-scale privatisation of public land and services, further embedded these modes of business in subsequent years (ibid.: 2598. cf. Petropoulou 2010). Most prominently, amongst these partnerships was the Unification of Athens Archaeological Sites programme (henceforth UAAS), which aimed to unify archaeological spaces in the Greek capital with cultural trails, promenades, pathways and recreational spaces, extending over 700 acres within the historical centre (Papageorgiou 2000: 178). The large scale project was meant to be completed in time for the commencement of the Athens Olympics in 2004, inspired—amongst others—by the first urban plan of the city created by architects Kleanthes and Schaubert in 1833 (ibid.: 179) who, in their own words, “design[ed] the drawings of New Athens, keeping in mind the glory and the beauty of the ancient one” (1832 in Bastéa 2000: 69). The UAAS however, along with the development of commercial and cultural districts, led to the expansion of gentrified housing districts, resulting in additional socio-spatial inequalities that already existed in the city (Alexandri 2018: 40). Apart from the heavy taxation imposed on citizens and the sufficient public debt accumulated for hosting the Olympics (Panagiotopoulou 2014), the rapid neoliberal reconfiguration experienced in Athens increased social inequalities, decreased public urban space, caused substantial environmental damage and displaced entire neighbourhoods. The urban re-development of a number of areas within Athens triggered urban mobilisations, especially on issues that concerned the environment and the appropriation of space (Arampatzi and Nicholls 2012: 2598; Makrygianni and Tsavdaroglou 2011).
1.2.3 The Right to the City

The Right to the City

Figure 1.3 “And they came along again on their new carriages to receive more taxes. Stepping out however, they felt that they were stepping on cotton and not on solid earth. They faced infinite tormented eyes with stones in their hands. Many carriages stayed there. They left and never came back. Never...” Graffiti in Plaka district, Athens (2015).

Photo used with permission by Konstantina Georganta.²

The burdening economic crisis that struck the country in 2008 led to additional urban mobilisation and placed Athens in the list of cities around the world fighting against class inequality, government corruption and financial austerity measures. Since then, the frequency and alternative forms of mobilisations not only strengthened the need to create non-party affiliated movements, but also amplified the sense of public space and the right to the city, sending ripples to other cities and localities throughout the country (Petropoulou et al. 2016: 46). These movements were further

² The picture accompanies the poem “Mobilisation in the City” by Katerina Zisaki. The poem is published as part of the Athens in a Poem collective which presents material on Greek ‘urban poetics’ utilising Athens as a backdrop. For more information see: http://athensinapoein.com/2015/02/21/κινητοποίηση-στην-πόλη/. [Last Accessed: 26/10/2018].
reinforced and inspired by the mass mobilisations of 2011 responding to the global financial crisis, crisis further transforming the operation and spatial practices of social and residential movements throughout the city (Arampatzi 2017a; 2017b). This further compelled residents’ initiatives to become more organised and to take a stance in their neighbourhoods, demonstrating their concern for various public spaces, including archaeological sites.

Currently, the political and socioeconomic crisis experienced in Greece has further enabled urban movements to proactively deal with an array of social, cultural, economic and political injustices in their neighbourhoods and beyond. One of the main causes persisting is the right to the city, as can be observed by the movements’ efforts to actively engage with Athens beyond the neoliberal and commercialist agendas imposed on its citizens by state and private interests. The existing circumstances have brought on the need for open, free public spaces which people can enjoy and express their creative and personal/collective forms of culture. Numerous occupied, self-sustained spaces, squats and hangouts have emerged in Greece in recent years, providing a platform for local communities and activists to create and promote alternative forms of culture at a time of crisis. Archaeological sites have a prominent position in this scene, especially for neighbouring localities in near proximity.

1.3 My Approach

Given the organic nature of my thesis, I have employed a multidisciplinary approach, utilising diverse methodological tools for the materialisation of this study. My work is based on methods developing in archaeological ethnography, consisting primarily of qualitative, unstructured and semi-structured interviews, site-participant observations, group discussions and meetings, as well as active participation and collaboration in various activities initiated by urban movements. Over the past six years, I developed a good rapport with active members of local communities, enabling me to discover the ways in which they perceive archaeological spaces, their engagement with these and their motivation to fight for them. In addition to local actors living in close proximity to archaeological spaces of interest, I have further interviewed and held discussions with artists, activists, urban geographers and sociologists as well as members of the archaeological service in order to gain a wide-ranging insight into the dynamics involved in the diverse uses and perceptions of these spaces. Given the qualitative nature of my interviews, this research selectively presents extracts that are directly relevant to the aims of the study, particularly focusing on residents that are actively involved in residential committees, associations or groups.

My archival data resources in regards to residential movements and associations include the brochures, newspapers/magazines, posters and statements they produce, as well as their activity on social media (Facebook groups/posts, events, blogs, etc.) Moreover, in order to better comprehend these and to further complement my active work with localities, my research makes use of theories
and methodologies deriving from the fields of social anthropology, urban geography and urban sociology. These also inform the sociopolitical and economic context of the current crisis, the effects on everyday life and values as well as the changes on the urban space of the city. Quantitative data attained by the Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT) provides supplemental information regarding neighbourhoods’ economic and social status. Further archival resources include historical archives varying from state and administrative records to local literature, as a means to understand the historical and archaeological significance of each case study.

An integral part of the methodology utilised for this thesis is autoethnography, based on my observations, experiences and reflexive investigation—a form of self-narrative which, as Reed-Danahay (1997: 9) asserts, “places the self within a social context”. This approach allows me to convey a better understanding of the qualitative component of my research, which comprises the majority of the fieldwork involved in the materialisation of my thesis. Following Ellis (et al. 2010), autoethnography allows for the incorporation of my personal experiences into the ethnographic descriptions of others and the analysis of their experiences, intersecting thus our endeavours, encounters and narratives. Through this approach, I am able to evoke elements of my investigation such as personal perspectives, thoughts and feelings shared by my participants, as well as my reactions and interpretations of these, which would otherwise be lost in the process. As such, these accounts can capture the full range of ideas and viewpoints regarding alternative interactions with archaeological sites today and their contemporary cultural biography through extra-official heritage discourses.

Employing elements from the emerging field of sensorial archaeology has further enabled me to identify and reflect on the multisensoriality of urban space and archaeological sites, that is, by holistically engaging through all bodily senses and not exclusively through a visual modality. This approach has allowed for the interweaving of these spaces’ sensorial experience in conjunction with their multitemporality, revealing the synchronistic interaction between remnants of the past and present reality of archaeological heritage within the Athenian urban pastiche.

It is important to note that the archaeological sites presented in this thesis are regarded as spaces which also act as recreational parks. They are thus often referred to colloquially by local communities as ‘parks’ or even as ‘groves’ [άλση or alsi], due to their natural features and operation as open spaces. In addition, Philopappou Hill is also known as the “hill” [λόφος or lófos]. As will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 4, Philopappou Hill is officially listed as an archaeological site but one that also acts as an open park, whereas Plato’s Academy has been declared an “archaeological grove”. Both the terms ‘archaeological site’ and ‘archaeological park’ are used interchangeably for the two case studies. For the purposes of this research, I will refer to these spaces primarily as ‘parks’ or ‘spaces’, preferring these terms over ‘archaeological sites’, as their dual nature goes beyond the standardised notion and perception of official and organised
archaeological sites. Chapter 5 further presents a discussion on the definition of ‘archaeological parks’ and their multifunctional properties through the relevant literature.

1.3.1 Archiving of Research Materials

Over the course of this study, I accumulated research materials ranging from audio recordings of interviews with participants, to photographs, journals, and short videos of various social activities and assemblies (a full list of archive materials is provided in Appendix A). The archiving of the material collected was efficiently and securely protected throughout the materialisation of my research, using organised and coded file names within two encrypted external drives, safely stored in separate locations and backed-up on a regular basis. No personal information was recorded from participants beyond their name and signature on the consent forms obtained to be a part of this project. These consent forms will be digitised and retained through the university’s repository (ePrints Soton; the system updates regularly via PURE, the institution’s research management system). My personal observations and notes will be also digitised (where necessary—as some have been handwritten in notebooks whilst others are already digital), and also be stored at the university’s repository. Selective interviews, particularly from the participants that feature prominently in this study, will also be retained through the university’s repository. The above data will be shared but not openly as it contains personal data which cannot be sufficiently anonymised (some participants may have revealed their own names and others’ in passing within recorded interviews). The hard copies of both consent forms and personal notes, along with transcription of interviews and relative annotations, will be destroyed according to the University’s Recommended Practices for Destruction of Data (University of Southampton 2017).

Videos and pictures provided to me by participants from their personal collections will be destroyed in accordance with the University’s Recommended Practices for Destruction of Data (University of Southampton 2017), as participants already have their own archival collections relating to the spaces of interest which are always expanding. In addition, short videos, sound clips of the spaces of interest, and images from assemblies which I have recorded in public spaces, will be given to residential movements for their archives.

Publications created by residential movements and publicly distributed such as leaflets, brochures, posters, and newspapers, will be digitised and stored at the university’s repository and accessible to the public. Pictures taken during the course of this research will further be stored through a dataset on Pure and accessible.

[^3]: Further information regarding University access and the Institutional Repository can be found at: http://library.soton.ac.uk/openaccess/policies [Last Accessed: May 21, 2019].
In the event of re-use of the collected data beyond this thesis for future publications, further consent from participants will be acquired.

1.4 Chapter Outline

This thesis consists of nine chapters. Chapter 2 critically reviews the relationship between archaeology and nationalism, examining the need for the decolonisation of the archaeological discipline. Within this context, it further explores the disciplinary and practical development of the Greek Archaeological Service from its creation to the present. It focuses on moments of significant changes that directly relate to the establishment of heritage management practices in the present and the distance created between the Service and the public.

Chapter 3 explores the literature which has formed the basis to my theoretical approach, emphasising the key elements discussed in my research: identity, temporality, and space. It investigates the particular themes within a neoliberal context, situating thus the present study within a contemporary social, economic and political milieu.

Chapter 4 presents a historical background of the two main case studies researched for this thesis; these consist of the open archaeological parks of Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy. It primarily explores state-coordinated representations of the archaeological spaces whilst also providing a brief account of the acts of contestation associated with them. The chapter also touches upon the neighbourhoods’ more recent history, supplemented with a demographic profile of the areas. This allows for a socioeconomic positioning of the local communities within the city’s greater urban environment.

Chapter 5 presents the theoretical and methodological tools I have selected for the materialisation of this research. Theoretically, it discusses the ways I have applied the concepts of identity, temporality and space in my work. Methodologically, it delves into the methods I utilised for the completion of this study, primarily constituted by archaeological ethnographic techniques such as participant and site observations, as well as qualitative interviews and archival research.

Chapter 6 focuses on the temporality of the spaces of interest. It presents the interplay between modern engagements and archaeological heritage, and the existence of an extra-official heritage discourse and narrative, beyond official narratives, interpretations and interactions. The array of social activities and re-appropriations observed in these spaces contribute to their multitemporality and their status as living archaeological sites.

Chapter 7 presents the clashes and conflicts that have occurred between residential activists and state authorities relating to the management and protection of the archaeological parks of Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy. This chapter focuses on the most significant issues and
events that have occurred in relation to these spaces, and addresses the prevalent issues of stewardship and ownership which emerge from these acts of contestation.

Chapter 8 explores the politics of identity developing from the daily interaction with living archaeological parks located within the urban context. It elaborates on the interplay between national and local identity, demonstrating the formation of an uneven matrix which often comes at the expense of local communities and the parks. Additionally, it presents the effects of exclusionary practices residents are subjected to, especially in their persistent efforts to be a part of decision-making processes which involve neighbouring archaeological spaces. Last, it explores the process of multivocality as similarity; it addresses the diverse voices existing within residential movements and the importance of this multiplicity in the formation of a unique layer of identification within a community and in relation to an archaeological space.

Finally, Chapter 9 reflects on the aims, key themes and research questions presented in this thesis.

1.5 On a Personal Note

Before delving into the literature and fundamental theoretical foundations and methodologies that have helped shape my research, I consider it necessary to provide a short introduction of myself for a number of reasons. First of all, my own personal, educational, cultural and sensorial experiences have not only moulded the way I perceive archaeological heritage, but also the way I identify myself within a local, national and international community. Therefore, my experiences will unavoidably affect my observations and reflections. Moreover, a self-introduction will further provide a better insight into the auto-ethnographic nature of my work, which complements the theoretical and methodological tools I have utilised for this thesis and acts as a bridge amongst the disciplinary fields employed to formulate a holistic approach to the subject matter.

I was born to Greek parents on a humid spring morning in Miami, Florida. Despite having lived in my place of birth for only a few months, it was that very location that determined the next eighteen years of my life. Raised in Athens, Greece, I attended an American private school within the Greek capital due to my American citizenship. School life had all the ‘requirements’ of an American teen-flick: cliques, jocks vs. nerds, inspirational teachers and frequent pep-rallies rewarding mediocrity. In many ways, I consider myself lucky for attending the school I did. We were taught from an early age to look beyond our textbooks to find answers to our inquiries as opposed to friends that endured the painstaking papagalia of the Greek educational system—learning to memorise and recite textbooks by heart and regurgitate the information much like a parrot [παπαγάλος – papagálos] would. Most importantly, we were able to learn about ancient civilisations in interactive and engaging ways; it was in fact a mock excavation we performed in our playground sandbox during first grade that prompted my desire to become an archaeologist when I grew up. We were required to celebrate both American and Greek holidays on account that the school was based in
Athens, which admittedly was often very overwhelming for students that shared neither nationality. My good friend Gurpreet from India will perhaps never forget singing ‘Duce Puts on his Uniform’ on ‘OXI Day’, a song mocking Mussolini’s unsuccessful attempt to occupy Greece during the initial stages of WWII.

For my neighbourhood friends (my ‘Greek’ friends as they were to be nicknamed so as to distinguish them from my school mates), I was known as the “αμερικανάκι” (little American). Despite being fluent in Greek, my ‘Greek’ friends were adamant on amplifying my ‘Greekness’, constantly imparting their knowledge on all matters Greek, particularly through mini history lessons. A more unfortunate nickname I recall from my primary school years— due to my private education and American citizenship— was “καπιταλόνι” ([kapitalóni] a play on the word “capitalist”). It took me several years to understand the gravity and the reasons behind the latter nickname. Ironically, my thesis critically assesses the burdens of neoliberal policies and capitalist schemes and their negative effects upon localities and on the fate of archaeological sites.

My first encounter with an ‘outward-in’ perception of Hellenism was in the fourth grade, through the writings of my American pen pal. Her questions were limited to ancient monuments and mythology, including whether we still wore togas and if we have electricity in our homes. It was perhaps then that I first realised that Greece was imagined as an extension of an Acropolis postcard, completely detached from its modern reality. As an adolescent, I travelled to numerous American/International schools throughout Europe to attend sports tournaments and even then, it seemed as though discussions revolved mainly around the Acropolis and Greece’s role as the cradle of Western civilisation.

My undergraduate and postgraduate studies at the universities of Southampton and Bristol developed my interest in studying the interaction of national identity through re-presentations of the past in the Greek educational system (mainly through primary school textbooks) and through the national signifiers represented at the opening ceremony of the Athens 2004 Olympic Games respectively. My courses on Archaeology and Society and Heritage Management during my second and third years as an undergraduate were perhaps the ones that triggered my initial keen interest into the complex relationship between the management of archaeological heritage and the role of society in that process. In the first, I discovered the importance of the reflexive relationship between contemporary societies and archaeological sites and the diverse, unofficial significations attributed by the former to the latter. In the second, I sadly realised how difficult it was to break through set mentalities when discussing an essay I had written, proposing the reactivation of the Tzisdaraki Mosque in the Monastiraki Plaza in Athens. Friends from home promptly discouraged me from producing such proposal, as if it were almost a sacrilegious act to reactivate a Muslim place of worship in such close proximity to the Acropolis and the Metropolitan Cathedral of Athens.
It was with these tools at hand that I was interested in further pursuing the alternative engagements existing between local communities and archaeological sites in a country with such strong sense of identity.
Chapter 2  Archaeology and the Public

The disciplinary practices and theoretical discourses of archaeology have changed considerably in the last thirty years. The gradual transition from a more scientifically-oriented discipline to a more person-centred archaeology has sent ripples of change on various levels, especially in the relationship between archaeology and the public. The post-processual theoretical and methodological wave led to a more direct and collaborative relationship between archaeology and the public, creating new discourses and implementing further anthropological practices. Archaeology has since become more open in its utilisation of interdisciplinary modes of research, resulting in more culturally, historically and politically attuned frameworks of study. Research, theoretical discourses and methodological practices have become more inclusive than ever before, transforming the discipline of archaeology to a more accessible and relevant tool in the present. The employment of anthropological practices in the field of archaeology have accentuated human relations with material culture and vice versa, bringing to the fore their multifaceted dynamics through processes of engagement. Public interaction with archaeological heritage has been significantly strengthened through the use of ethnography in particular, providing for more in-depth insight into the re-appropriation of remnants of the past in the present.

Despite the effort to bridge the gap between archaeology and the public through the application of interdisciplinary methods and approaches, there are chasms to be reconciled. The discipline of archaeology is still haunted by its colonial and nationalist past, evident in the disciplinary practices and lack of consistent social inclusion in the contribution of new knowledge in the archaeological record. The ‘view from the top’ has long overshadowed the cultural biography of archaeological sites and monuments, particularly in their co-existence with communities that experience them as part of their daily lives. This chapter critically explores the relationship between archaeology and the public from different perspectives; namely, it examines the view from the ‘top’—the hegemonic structures of society—and the ‘bottom’, those representing the public and particularly local communities. First, it assesses the use of archaeological heritage as a nation-building instrument by hegemonic structures by briefly discussing theories of nationalism, which have contributed to the existing discourse on the convergence of nationalism and archaeology. Through this spectrum, this chapter investigates the repercussions of this relationship and its effects today, as well as the gradual decolonisation of the discipline in more recent years. As such, it delves into the view of archaeology from ‘below’, providing a closer look into the variety of community and grassroots interactions with archaeological heritage, re-appropriations of and efforts to protect archaeological sites. This chapter additionally presents an overview of the complex particularities of the Greek case,
considering both the intricacies of the view from above as well as from below. The aim is to provide a theoretical, historical and ontological background both of the development of the discipline of archaeology in terms of its nationalist and colonial bounds, as well as its transformative methodological applications in its effort to (re)connect with the public.

### 2.1 A critique on the use of archaeological heritage for nation-building purposes

In his *History of Archaeological Thought*, Bruce Trigger (2006: 211-235) discusses the transition between evolutionary and culture-historical archaeology, the latter coinciding with an increase of nationalism and racism during the late nineteenth century. The sociopolitical context of the time provided the necessary platform for the discipline of archaeology to prevail as a leading tool for nations’ legitimisation, since ethnicity became central in/to the shaping of human history. The political, economic and social unrest during the creation of nation-states in Europe, prompted the need to unite divided citizens by motivating lasting political divisions amongst nations, leading to the use of archaeology in order to promote national unity and self-determination through the incorporation of archaeological findings (Banks 1996:1). The archaeological record and its associated interpretations and manipulations by political units stimulated a sense of national pride and solidarity, as well as legitimisation of states’ longevity and sovereign rights over land, necessary to overcome existing social and political conflict.

#### 2.1.1 Archaeology and Nationalism

The use of heritage and cultural elements for the formation of national identity during the early nation-building years of Europe has been stressed by a number of scholars studying the development of nationalism (Anderson 2006; Breuilly 1993; Gellner 1983; Hobsbawm 1992; Hroch 1996; Smith 1986; 2009). The emergence of nationalism not only affected the disciplinary practices of archaeology as a field, but was detrimental to existing local narratives, expressions of culture, and engagements with archaeological heritage from that point on. The foundations of the relationship between archaeology and the public were therefore set in the midst of nation-building projects, further determining the future of interactions between heritage and the public.

One of the most prominent theories of nationalism and its varying degrees of using antiquity as a means for validation comes from Ernest Gellner’s social anthropological approach. Gellner (1983) highlights the development of nationalism as a modern construct with cultural and political roots, emphasising the importance of nationalism in consolidating national and cultural constituents. He advocates that cultures ultimately become “natural repositories” of political legitimacy through a process of accumulating selective cultural elements, which the masses will automatically identify with and recognise (ibid.: 55, 57). His thesis argues that the social conditions under which the
modern national state was established, enabled “standardised, homogenous, centrally sustained high cultures” to pervade entire populations, thus giving rise to a unified form of cultural unit “which men willingly and often ardently identify” (ibid.: 55). This imposition of “high culture” on society through the growth of nationalist sentiment systematically eradicated ‘lower’ forms of culture produced by local groups. Essentially, it set a precedent both in the local vis-à-vis national nexus—the beginning of an unbalanced relationship—and a default set of practices adopted by archaeologists.

This particular process described by Gellner is one that is evident in numerous political entities around the world, and in the Greek case as well. The distinctive presence of archaeological heritage in the form of instantly recognisable cultural and symbolic signifiers is a prevalent paradigm of the unwritten reaffirming of the nation’s identity through elements of “high culture”, still present in society today (Hamilakis and Yalouri 1996). The signifiers’ promotion through various mediums within society—education, media, advertisements, cultural heritage sector, etc.—persistently validates their principal status in the nation’s imagination. Through this process however, what is lost—as Gellner suggests—are the complex structures of local groups (1983: 57). These high forms of culture—such as the instantly recognisable signifiers and unalterable narratives—overshadow local expressions of culture that in reality constitute the elements from which nationalism selects the most suitable features to support its ambitions. Interestingly, Gellner considers the worshipping of ‘borrowed’ elements of local/folk cultures, which have been stylised to fit a national framework and function, as perpetuating and reaffirming symbols of the nation's longevity, a form of sociological self-deception (ibid.: 58).

Gellner’s emphasis on the political dimension of nationalism is important, as it is through political structures that the necessary ‘tools’ are selected in order to create the optimum circumstances for the consolidation of constituents and the rise of nationalism. This process for political legitimacy requires the accumulation of high cultural elements chosen selectively from local societies but inevitably to their detriment; their status as lower forms of culture deemed them unnecessary for the production of a national narrative, resulting in their loss or oblivion. These tools reflect in many ways the carefully selected antiquities, narratives and historical pasts that were chosen for the legitimisation of the Greek nation, not only fabricating a sense of cohesion between these but also disregarding the local population in the process. ‘Exotic’ cultural elements that did not fit the idealised representation of a glorious civilisation were considered undesirable relics of an unfamiliar past. Ironically, to a certain extent, even the local population itself did not fulfil the ‘high cultural elements’ of the elite; the latter proceeded in treating them simultaneously as a backward population whilst presenting folk culture to the rest of the world as evidence of the Greeks’ “glorious common heritage” (Herzfeld 1987: 10).

Much like Gellner, Benedict Anderson (2006) views nations and nationalism as modern constructs, from a historical-materialist perspective. He primarily attributes their production to cultural roots,
arguing that the appearance of nationalism towards the end of the eighteenth century was a cultural product which can be understood by aligning it with the cultural systems that preceded it, out of which—as well as against which—it came into being (ibid.: 12). Anderson defines the nation as: “an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (ibid.: 6). His definition is powered by innate social dynamics created between members of a community, which—regardless of whether they ever meet in person—will habitually identify with one another. In discussing the cultural roots of nationalism, Anderson describes the transition from religious and cultural social constructions and ideologies to secular transformations, from a socio-cultural perspective. Within this approach, he raises a crucial argument not only in the formation of nations and nationalism, but also in the transition between old cultural systems and modernity. He proposes the “secular transformation of fatality into continuity, contingency into meaning” from religious modes of thought, fostering thus the notion that “nations loom out of an immemorial past”, a concept central to the creation of a national consciousness (ibid.: 11). It is through this process that communities are able to imagine themselves existing through homogenous, empty time (ibid.: 26, 187, 194). This conception of time was supplemented through print-capitalism and the production of the census, the map, and the museum, further enabling the systemisation of communities being ruled, the territorialisation of nations, and the legitimacy of their ancestry (ibid.: 164-185). Most importantly, in terms of the establishment of museums within this context, Anderson demonstrates how the promotion and production of an “ancient prestige” were profoundly political—in many cases to the detriment of local communities—in order to ensure national symbols and visual representations as evidence of inheritance from the past (ibid.: 178-183).

Anderson’s approach on nationalism has deeply influenced my work. The concept of the nation as an imagined entity by its community provides a conducive framework through which this research develops the intricate makings of the Greek national identity and consciousness. His thesis encompasses the main features which formulate a nation and the sentiment of nation-ness; the combination of a common language and cultural/historical background, along with the linking processes of print-capitalism, justify his argument of the nation as an innately limited, sovereign and imagined community. The multiplicity and timelessness of Anderson’s work—presenting global examples with diverse features and characteristics for the formation of nations (without restricting his research to Europe as many studies on nationalism have)—enables for new, synthesised perspectives on nationalism in the present.

Anthony Smith’s work on nationalism through an ethno-symbolist approach (1986; 2001; 2008; 2009), emphasises the significance of pre-modern ethnic sentiment to the formation of nations and nationalism. While he agrees with the modernist view that nations are “dynamic, purposive
sociological communities” (1986: 11), he stresses the importance of pre-modern ethnic ties in the foundation and persistence of nations. Smith thus focuses on the integral role of cultural elements such as symbols, myths, memory, value, ritual and tradition as imperative tools for the analysis of ethnicity, nations and nationalism (2009: 20-21). He claims that there are multifaceted dimensions that contribute to the foundations of ethnic communities and subsequently to nations. Amongst others, these include a collective name that establishes the “identifying mark of an ethnie in the historical record” (1986: 22) and which acts as a critical element to ethno-genesis (2009: 46); a common myth of descent which provides a “collective location in the world and the charter of the community which explains its origins, growth and destiny” (1986: 24), to be gradually developed and crystallised by the elite (2009: 47); a shared history and distinctive cultures upon which communities have a sense of shared memories and cultural elements that distinguish them from outsiders, as well as an association with a specific territory which ethnie “call their ‘own” (1986: 28). He therefore argues that the formation of nations depended heavily on these foundational elements, which in turn play a catalytic role in the production of nationalist sentiment.

However, Smith does not offer substantial information on the role of political structures in his discussion on nationalism, focusing primarily on symbolic and social elements in an effort to “amend the predominately political and economic models offered by modernists” (2009: 40). A major drawback in Smith’s work is that he does not adequately investigate the processes and significance of political implication to the formation of nationalism. This omission perhaps indicates his need to emphasise the ethnic origins of nations rather than the role of political dimensions in the production of nationalism.

On the other hand, Gellner and Anderson have given particular attention to the centrality of political structures in the formation of national identity and, although they have extensively discussed the impact of the systematic imposition of nationalist agendas on the people, they do not reflect expansively on the view from ‘below’. For this reason, Eric Hobsbawm’s approach to the development of nationalism has been integral to my perception of the phenomenon and my understanding of both the disciplinary practices of archaeology as well as the role of the public in the process. His definition of nationalism coincides with Gellner’s, highlighting the congruency between the political and national unit (Hobsbawm 1992: 9). Hobsbawm however, takes his thesis a step further, accentuating the importance of the ‘view from below’, beyond the contemporary political and economic transitions enabled by hegemonic structures. He emphasises the historical and locally rooted social elements contributing to the creation of national identification by the ‘ordinary persons’ which constitute a nation. Furthermore, Hobsbawm asserts that official ideologies of states and movements cannot be considered guides to “what is in the minds” of ‘ordinary’ people, nor that the existence of national identification excludes or is even superior to “the remainder of the set of identifications which constitute the social being” (ibid.: 11). Therefore, he argues for a popular ‘proto-nationalism’, which—drawing from Anderson’s concept of an
‘imagined community’—emerged from the mobilisation of national movements and states of pre-existing, collective sentiment of belonging, and operated on a macro-political scale applied to modern states and nations (ibid.: 46).

The above theoretical approaches to the creation of nations and nationalism inform the sociopolitical context within which the institutionalisation and politicisation of archaeology developed. The epistemological and ontological foundations of archaeology not only moulded national imagination, but also marked the way archaeology has operated as a discipline ever since (Diaz-Andreu 2001: 432-434; Hamilakis 2007a). In his seminal paper on alternative archaeologies, Bruce Trigger (1984) briefly discusses the characteristics of nationalist, colonialist, and imperialist perspectives and their effects on the practice of archaeology. Through various paradigms, he argues that some of the elements which contributed to the formation of a nationalist archaeology include suppressed nationalities, the encouragement for unity and cooperation, territorial affirmation, government patronage and glorification (ibid.: 358). Furthermore, national unity, ethnic continuity and the bolstering of pride and morale are additional factors contributing to the establishment of a nationalist archaeology (ibid.: 359-360). Trigger makes a slight differentiation when approaching the features of colonialist archaeology, emphasising the need for colonial powers to denigrate native societies and justify their supremacy through racially-stimulated practices.

In addition, archaeologists Margarita Diaz-Andreu and Timothy Champion (1996: 2-3) highlight the influence of nationalism for the lack of a "non-political, value-free archaeology", citing its deep entrenchment in the very concept of archaeology, both in its institutionalisation and development. Moreover, they assert the profound connection between nationalism and the creation of archaeology as a science, reflecting on the political foundations of the discipline and its effect on the field’s infrastructure (ibid.). Trigger, on the other hand, considers the importance attributed to nationalism by Diaz-Andreu and Champion in the formation of the archaeological discipline, extreme (2006: 248). He argues that the discipline of archaeology played a subordinate role to that of history, and that not all archaeology was national in orientation (ibid. cf. Kaeser 2002). The latter, nonetheless, insist that the appearance of nationalism was the very stimulus for the institutionalisation of archaeology, prompting its infrastructure and the organisation of archaeological knowledge (Diaz-Andreu and Champion 1996: 3). Trigger’s moderate approach reveals a degree of critical distance, which could pertain to the middle ground and advocacy for theoretical balance shared within the Canadian archaeological context (Williamson et al. 2006: 11).

His sense of clarity and neutrality are very appealing, but so is the determination expressed by Diaz-Andreu and Champion. I believe that the truth is to be found somewhere in between the two approaches; the plurality and diversity of nations combined with archaeological practices and traditions in different states, possesses varying levels of influence of nationalism upon archaeology. Here too, just like in the multiplicity of debates concerning the formation of nationalism, it is challenging to define a development that involves such multifaceted activity and factors. Every
case is particular and even though it is possible to find commonalities and similar features, it is also necessary to focus on each paradigm as context-specific, with its own elements and idiosyncrasies. Diaz-Andreu and Champion present a very compelling argument on the matter, especially in regards to the Greek case and the models of other European nation-states. Despite the clash of opinions, there is an undisputable and durable relationship between the two notions, which has significantly sustained both in various ways since their inevitable convergence.

The practical aspects of this intersection have further been examined by a number of academics. A prominent collection of studies investigating this relationship, includes Philip L. Kohl and Clare Fawcett’s (1995) edited volume on nationalism and the practice of archaeology. It covers case studies from around the world, aiming to present the varying forms of association between nationalism and archaeology in the past, whilst placing them within contemporary theoretical debates and considering both the scientific and political implications of this convergence today. As such, the editors hope to “demystify nationalist myths and...help to defuse of today’s all too prevalent ethnic tensions” (ibid.: 4). Apart from their overambitious aim, Kohl and Fawcett’s thesis departs from my own in two very distinctive points: first, they proceed to present an “ethnically inspired archaeology” as a justifiable means of stimulating archaeological research and promoting cultural traditions which build pride in communities, differentiating them from the abuses of the archaeology in nationalist politics (ibid.: 5). This simplistic approach removes the political dimension from claims to the past, essentially recycling the very issues of the topic they claim to tackle. At the same time, they assert that “distorted, nationalist archaeology must be confronted, not ignored” (ibid.: 16), while simultaneously acknowledging the sociopolitical contexts in which these were reproduced. This inconsistency is proof that the study of nationalism and archaeological narratives requires not only to consider the construction of identity within its sociopolitical context but also a critical deconstruction in order to effectively oppose nationalist narratives of the past and present as hegemonic discourses (Hamilakis 1996: 977). Second, and relative to the first point, the editors’ objectivist and optimistic attitude in regards to the archaeologist’s scientific and ethical evaluation of nationalist manipulations of archaeological heritage today (Kohl and Fawcett 1995: 17-18), reveals yet again, not only a sense of naïveté but a failure to consider the sociopolitical influences and personal ideologies of archaeologists which influence research and practices in a reflexive manner, much like the very case studies from the past presented in the volume.

Overall, the use of archaeological heritage for nation-building projects considerably influenced the ontological foundations and practical methodologies of the discipline. It allowed for the exploitation of heritage by hegemonic structures in the nineteenth century, shaping the field of archaeology as a tool primarily used by the ‘top’ in order to control the masses. The power over the creation of narratives, discourses and identities were complemented by the politicised nature of the newly formed archaeological discipline. The fundamental influence of nationalism upon archaeology has in turn seeped into the interpretive and perceptive prisms still used by
archaeologists and hegemonic structures in the present. It is therefore no surprise that archaeological research in a number of countries has been suppressed or controlled by governments in the present for political reasons in several European countries (Trigger 2006: 250). Unfortunately, this control of the past and its material remnants has created a substantial gap between entities from the ‘top’ and the general public. These entities may take the form of governmental structures and offices—most frequently including national archaeological services—much like in the Greek case. This control has therefore long overshadowed or even eradicated local expressions of culture as described by Gellner and Anderson, for the sake of a cohesive national history, identity and narrative, legitimised by the use of archaeological remnants. The interaction between archaeology and the public—both in the past but also in the present—has been a topic of discussion in more recent years, bringing to the fore the various uses of the past from ‘below’. These discussions have not only revealed the multiplicity of engagements between the public and archaeological heritage, but have also enriched scholarly endeavours through various forms of collaboration with communities.

2.2 Archaeology from Below

What does ‘archaeology from below’ even mean?

There is no single definition for the term as there is no one way to describe the diverse forms of archaeology from below. This is attributed to the fact that it embodies different types of dynamics, interfaces, collaborations and strategies. My personal understanding of what archaeology from below entails incorporates three basic elements: cultural heritage, archaeological practice, and the public. These elements are further subdivided into additional ‘categories’, according to the type of heritage involved, the variety of practices and methodologies utilised, and the different kind of communities or publics participating. Of course, the intersection of these elements are further regulated by heritage laws existing in different regions and countries around the world, which often determine the extent—or in many cases, prevention of—public participation in the archaeological process. Most importantly, an essential component of archaeology from below and public engagement with heritage pertains to matters of ethics and issues of ownership, and the understanding that there are multiple archaeologies beyond official, modernist ones (see Hollowell and Mortensen 2009; Schnapp et al. 2004; Thomas 2004).

As a term, archaeology from below is most commonly associated with Neil Faulkner (2000), who views it as an alternative approach to practicing field archaeology outside the limits of ‘official’, legislated practices. His work discusses the problematic nature of state legislation and bureaucratic processes and control which hinder not only the active production of archaeological knowledge in general, but more specifically the engagement of interested and enthusiastic members of the public to be a part of the process. Through his own experience at the Sedgeford Historical and
Archaeological Research Project (2002), Faulkner proposes a democratic model for archaeology from below (2000: 30-33). He asserts that projects should be community-based, enabling the recovery of heritage to become a living process “in which a multitude of interest and perspectives enrich the archaeological process” (ibid.: 31). As such, local communities and the public in general will not be ‘passive receivers’ of archaeology from above, nor will they be consumers of “fully-processed and prepacked ‘heritage’ served to them by expert guardians of ‘ancient monuments’” (ibid.: 29). Although Faulkner’s work is specifically centred on field archaeology and the practical aspects of the discipline, his broader arguments speak to the uneven dynamic existing between ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ archaeological practices and interpretations. His work touches upon the politics of archaeology and matters of ownership of the material remnants of the past, asserting the need to deconstruct existing power structures and providing more access to the people. After all, social sciences are characterised by a fluidity which allows for conscious collective action to transform nature and society itself, through social experience and diversity (ibid.: 26). I agree with Faulkner when he suggests that no two archaeological projects are ever the same and that no matter how ‘professional’ or official a scheduled excavation may be, the processes, diverse individuals, and interpretations involved will always vary within such an organic and fluid practice.

Beyond Faulkner, the extensive literature on the interface between archaeology and society demonstrates the constant growth and adaptability of the broader field. It reveals the array of different engagements involved in participatory endeavours to produce archaeological knowledge from ‘below’. A number of social scientists have contributed to this discourse from their particular field of research and sociopolitical contexts: indigenous archaeology (Atalay 2006; 2007; 2012), sociality of public archaeology (Castañeda and Matthews 2008), archaeology in society, in academia and in popular culture (Holtorf 2005, 2007, 2009) community archaeology (Marshall 2002 & 2009), heritage management and museums (Merriman 1991, 2000, 2004), Participatory Action Research and archaeological ethics (Pyburn 2009), encapsulating the various forms of public, community, and indigenous archaeologies through the active collaboration between archaeologists and communities.

2.2.1 Public Archaeology

A quick online search through academic journals on public archaeology will provide an abundance of articles with titles attempting to define the field. Much like the term “archaeology from below”, public archaeology too does not have one all-encompassing definition. Once again, this is a testament to the multifaceted nature of the field and the breadth of disciplinary practices and theoretical perspectives associated with it. I have come to find Lorna-Jane Richardson’s and Jaime Almansa- Sánchez’s (2015: 194) definition of public archaeology closest to my view of the field: “…a disciplinary practice and a theoretical position…exercised through the democratisation of
archaeological communication, activity or administration, through communication [with and involvement of] the public or the preservation and administration of archaeological resources for public benefit by voluntary or statutory organisations”. An extension of this definition would further include Neal Ascherson’s (2000: 2) view of archaeology’s place within “the real world of economic conflict and political struggle”. Ascherson provides a pragmatic perspective on the inevitable effects of the economic and political milieus on prospective interactions between hegemonic structures and the public. My particular interest in public archaeology lies in the effect of the politics of the past upon present archaeological practices, in the inclusion of the ‘publics of interest’ in decision-making processes, and the power relations involved within the current sociopolitical and economic context.

Since the term gained widespread attention through the publication of the book Public Archaeology by Charles R. McGimsey (1972), it has been used to incorporate the interaction between archaeology and the public—for the benefit of the latter, as well as the relevant discourses concerning ethical issues, legislative measures, and the preservation of archaeological resources. The development of the field enabled a shift from conventional archaeological practices through the examination of the relationship between archaeology and contemporary society. This change further facilitated the essential connection between the cultural, political and economic aspects of contemporary society, within the context of systemic power relations which unavoidably affect the objectives and methods utilised for archaeological activities (Matsuda 2004: 67). The field is continuously re-evaluated from a critical perspective, reassessing fundamental principles and practices, and providing new ground for research for the diverse stakeholders, archaeological resources and approaches involved (Skeates et al. 2012: 1).

Theoretical approaches have particularly focused on defining ‘the public’ in an effort to overcome potential issues hindering the inclusion of bottom-up interventions and contributions in decision-making processes regarding archaeological resources. There is a general understanding that once a ‘public’ has been adequately identified, it allows for the aims of specific projects within the field of public archaeology to become coherent and explicit (Carman 2002: 96-112; Matsuda 2004: 66; Merriman 2004: 1-2). My thesis follows Akira Matsuda’s (2004) and Nick Merriman’s (2004) approach in distinguishing ‘the public’ through Jürgen Habermas’s (1989) concept of the public sphere. Despite critical interventions for his lack of adequate attention to gender (Fraser 1990) and the “plebeian public sphere” (McGuigan 1996: 24), Habermas’s work provides a theoretical framework through which the social structures of the public sphere can be applied in determining ‘the public’ in public archaeology, and the potential dynamic between the state and the people. Habermas’s distinction between two notions of the ‘public’—that of the state acting for the benefit of the people, and the idea of the ‘public’ as an entity consisting of individuals critically engaging with the state. The public sphere within society functions as a space for democratic exchanges between the people, confronting—amongst others—issues relating to public authority (Habermas
Matsuda (2004: 70) employs the interaction between the two notions of the public as a link which would—within the context of public archaeology—“encourage an open debate on archaeology”. In the same light, Merriman (2004: 5) views the field as an open space in which debates between the functions of official structures of archaeology on behalf of the public and stakeholding publics can occur, allowing for productive forms of “negotiation and conflict over meaning” to act as a platform for future—fruitful—endeavours.

### 2.2.2 Community Archaeology

Another form of archaeology from below is the practice of community archaeology. Yvonne Marshall (2002; 2009) defines the concept as a practice involving the active collaboration between archaeologists and communities, giving particular emphasis on establishing a cooperative relationship between the two. She stresses the value of going beyond “legal courtesies” which pertain to archaeologists seeking permission from communities (2009: 1078). As such, she highlights the significance of forming a dynamic in which archaeologists value communities’ opinions and strive to meet their needs in their effort to achieve archaeological goals (ibid.). Most importantly, Marshall asserts the aim of community archaeology is to move beyond the nationalist, colonialist, and imperialist roots of archaeology, facilitating the production of new knowledge, interpretations, and inclusive heritage management practices relating to archaeological heritage (ibid.: 1079).

Community-based projects are present in various parts of the world and consist of a diverse set of practices. They consist of archaeological heritage from different time periods, varied settings and wide-ranging forms of communities. The plurality that characterises these projects therefore constitute community archaeology as a practice with an extensive set of interdisciplinary methods.

Despite the interchangeability between the terms ‘public’ and ‘community’ archaeology, there are subtle differences between the two, primarily dealing with the types of communities involved in participatory archaeological projects. Marshall (2002: 216) distinguishes two kinds of community—one consisted of local residents living near or on a particular site, and the other consisting of descendants who can trace their connection to the people who once lived near or at a site. Working with descendant communities often overlaps with another form of archaeology from below—indigenous community. Again, the two fields are often used interchangeably in scholarly literature, as they deal with indigenous peoples in countries in which the course of colonisation has alienated them from their own heritage resources (Marshall 2009: 1081; Atalay 2006: 280-281). Therefore, regional distinctions and historical circumstances such as colonial interferences, constitute community and indigenous archaeology as practices which primarily take place in countries with strong colonial pasts such as Australia, Canada, the US and New Zealand. The ‘public’ or the community involved in community and indigenous archaeology can therefore be more easily distinguished than publics that include non-descendant, rural or urban communities.
The flexibility of practices involved in both fields, can be applicable in participatory projects that do not comprise indigenous communities, much like the community-based participatory project performed at the archaeological site of Çatalhöyük (Atalay 2007), in Qeisir, Egypt (Moser et al. 2002), the Hendon School Archaeology Project (Moshenka et al. 2011), as well as the community outreach programme in Lancaster, Pennsylvania (Levine et al. 2005). Some notable case studies in Greece include the public outreach programmes concerning local communities and monuments conducted on the island of Naxos, Greece (Lekakis 2013), engaging local communities in heritage decision-making processes in Gonies, Crete (Kyriakidis and Anagnostopoulos 2017), as well as the archaeological ethnographic research utilising practices developed within community and public archaeology in Koutroulou Magoula (Hamilakis and Theou 2013).

Sonya Atalay (2006: 294-295) accentuates the need for indigenous archaeology to act as a part of a decolonising process within the discipline, aiming to incorporate indigenous concepts and knowledge in the archaeological record. Similarly, Faulkner and Marshall stress the urgency for social inclusion and the creation for horizontal collaborations between archaeologists and communities. All express the need for communities to be a part of the archaeological process as, more often than not, they are the ones who experience archaeological heritage in their everyday lives—and do so beyond modernist and official interpretations of the past. Their unique perceptions, significations and values they attribute to heritage, would most likely be forgotten if they were left to ‘official’, standardised practices. Most importantly, they highlight the significance of their sense of stewardship—one that is context-specific and is beyond the problematic conceptualisation of the ethic of conservation as one that is linked to the “logic of commodity and to identity processes such as colonial and national glorification” (Hamilakis 2007b: 28-29). As such, they consistently emphasise the need to participate in the protection and preservation of archaeological heritage, whether they are directly connected to it or not.

2.2.3 Archaeological Ethnography as a Tool for Reconciliation

The gap existing between archaeology and the public will most probably always be present. As long as there are political structures controlling public affairs through the imposition of regulations and policies, there will always be a need to reassess and revaluate the discipline’s relationship with the public. The most prominent tool to reconcile this gap is the utilisation of archaeological ethnography and the manifold prospects that emerge through it. This section suffices to a brief overview of the field, whereas the breadth of methodologies utilised—particularly in my research—will be further presented in Chapter 5.

Yannis Hamilakis and Aris Anagnostopoulos (2009: 65) define archaeological ethnography as a “trans-disciplinary and trans-cultural space that enables researchers and diverse publics to engage in various conversations, exchanges, and interventions”. They argue for a multi-temporal, multi-sited and critically reflexive approach to archaeological endeavours centred on materiality
and temporality. As such, one of the aims of this space is the systematic revaluation of the ontological and epistemological foundations of the discipline, reconsidering official practices rooted in modernist modes of operating and thinking. The authors address the need for a more politically and socially attuned practice which is able to situate itself in a contemporary context, drawing attention to the importance of archaeology as a social practice in the present. In doing so, archaeological ethnography facilitates a multivocal and dialogic platform between archaeology and the public, aiming to decolonise the discipline and create a more inclusive and participatory space. Much like the social archaeological fields in which archaeological ethnography is most commonly employed in, the term is defined within a “deliberately broad framework” (ibid.: 83) so as to indicate the flexibility it entails and the diversity of publics, materialities and temporalities involved.

The sociality of archaeology and the need to decolonise the discipline through the use of ethnography has been extensively discussed, both on a theoretical level but also through participatory projects with diverse communities and in varied settings: through the use of ethnographic installation in Yucatán, México (Castañeda 2008), ‘conversations’ around Kruger National Park, South Africa (Meskell 2005), through community-based heritage management among indigenous communities in British Columbia, Chatham Islands and in Michigan (Hollowell and Nicholas 2009), through the practice of ‘looting’ in Kozani, Greece (Antoniadou 2012), the search for meaning and identity in Methana, Greece (Forbes 2007), and through cultural revitalisation by indigenous social movements in Arctic Finland (Magnani and Magnani 2018).

The use of ethnographic methods in archaeology is not new; however, its systematic use particularly in the last thirty years has developed as a means to better comprehend the vast changes in the relationships between the discipline, the past, and stakeholders (Castañeda 2008: 2). These transitions have been catalytic in the need to address political, ethical, social and epistemological issues and in the reassessment of archaeological practices (ibid.).

2.3 The Greek Case: The Role of Antiquities and Archaeology in National Imagination

The relationship between archaeology and the public in Greece has undergone a sea of change whilst simultaneously standing completely still. This paradox is primarily a result of the top-to-bottom, institutional practices imposed by the Greek state and its associated services, sustaining a stagnated relationship between the discipline and the public. Nevertheless, in more recent years there have been substantial efforts to reconcile the gap between the two, predominately from scholarly/academic or even private initiatives.
The ghost of archaeology past that still haunts the present Greek reality is attributed to the role of antiquity and archaeology in the construction of national identity and imagination in Greece during the formational years of the nation-state. This phenomenon has been studied extensively by prominent scholars (Herzfeld 1982; Leontis 1995; Gourgouris 1996; Hamilakis 2007a). The facilitated importation of Western ideals—a romanticised version of Greeks’ classical identity—was a notion unfamiliar to the indigenous population at the time (Lowenthal 1988: 733). It was a project undertaken primarily by the European elite, including diasporic Greek intellectuals (Brown and Hamilakis 2003: 5). The central role of antiquity in this endeavour acted as legitimisation of the nation’s longevity and significance, or as Anderson (2006: 178-183) asserts, a form of “ancient prestige”—tangible evidence of inheritance from the past. It was during this time—the early years of the creation of the nation-state nearly two hundred years ago—that the Greek Archaeological Service was established. The ideological and practical foundations of the Service were formed during the concurrent development of the state and the Service, playing thus a decisive role in the course of Greek archaeological theory and method. Official disciplinary practices, the production of knowledge, and state bureaucracy enabled the gradual solidification of a cohesive national narrative that interconnected the multi-temporal archaeological remnants in a strict chronological framework, whilst simultaneously alienating the public. This process was achieved by systematically isolating and fossilising a version of the past that seemed almost ‘untouchable’ from contemporary society. The distance created between the contemporary indigenous population and the ancient past during the early years of the nation state has yet to be fully reconciled.

2.3.1 Official Provisions and Regulations

The first provision for antiquities was drafted in April 1833, two months after the arrival of King Otto in Greece, and involved the excavation, conservation and protection (from exportation) of antiquities (Kokkou 1977: 70). The official establishment of the Service in May 1833 also led to the installation of the first archaeological law in 1834 regarding the “scientific and technological collections, for the discovery and preservation of antiquities and their uses” (ibid.: 72). Most importantly, it was through the first administrative measures that the emerging state established the ownership and exclusive care of the classical past, thus officially introducing state patronage into Greek archaeology (Voudouri 2010: 550; Sakellariadi 2010: 517; Kotsakis 1991: 65; Kokkou 1977: 3, 9-46). As Voudouri (2010: 550) notes, the 1834 law ultimately laid the foundations for Greek legislation on antiquities which progressively established the state’s exclusive right of ownership over all antiquities.

Interestingly, in the short history provided by the Directorate of the National Archive of Monuments (n.d.)—responsible for curating the Historical Archive of the Archaeological Service—it was “educated people” that saved antiquities from destruction and further prevented their transfer to western European countries during the pre-revolutionary years. In effect, this
description affirms the institutionalisation of archaeology in Greece in the nineteenth century and legitimises its authoritative status. The ‘educated people’ that secured the country’s cultural capital during the creation of the nation state were to gradually ‘meld’ into the ‘stewards’ of the past working in the Service. Today, there seems to be a notion that, similarly to rescuing antiquities in the nineteenth century, the Service is responsible for carrying out an equally ‘sacred’ and crucial role when managing antiquities. What is palpably absent in the above overview is any mention of involvement, or contribution, of the public as discussed in the previous section. This proves somewhat puzzling when one reads article 61 of the first legislation issued by the Service in 1834 regarding the protection of all Greek antiquities, claiming that “all antiquities within Greece, as works of the ancestors of the Hellenic people, are regarded as national property of all the Hellenes in general” (Voudouri 2010: 549; Sakellariadi 2010: 517 cf. Petrakos 1982: 132). The public is merely mentioned as a passive receiver of their “ancestors’” work. Additionally, the authoritative status that charges any state service legislation, which includes phrasings such as “ancestors” and “national property”, allows these terms to become official truths in the minds of the public, and further advocates the idea of continuity and heredity from a glorious past. The legislations and provisions that followed were similar in nature to the above.

The centrality of the classical past, both in its importance in Western imagination and in its inevitable role in the foundation of the Service, contributed to the formation of a strict ideological model which disregarded anything that could not be directly connected to it (Kotsakis 1991: 67). This focus on and isolation of the classical past was decisive in shaping not only the significance and attention provided to remnants from other chronological periods of Greek antiquity, but also the theoretical and practical development of the Greek archaeological discipline overall. Inspired by ideas of cultural continuity, the prehistoric and Byzantine pasts were to be incorporated into the grander national narrative as preceding and extending the significance of the classical past (Kitromilides 1996: 167-168, 1998; Shanks 1996: 80). Despite, however, the broadening of chronological horizons, the treatment of the classical past was permanently embedded in archaeological practice, still evident in modern State ideology and in the management of archaeological heritage by the Service. Kostas Kotsakis (1991: 81) views this as a result of the reluctance of Greek archaeology to adopt theoretical innovations and changing paradigms coming from the metropolises of archaeology combined with the lack of infusion of new ideas within the Service. Although this is true to a certain extent, the matter is more complicated than Kotsakis’s observation. It involves the systematic deconstruction of historical narratives and interpretations, which have for so long acted as the foundation of a robust national identity and which have only more recently been tackled by a recent wave of Greek archaeologists who are developing new theoretical and practical approaches to the past. Taking into consideration the centrality of antiquity and archaeology in national imagination, the deconstruction of the basic components that form Greek consciousness could most likely be considered the equivalent to a sacrilegious act, but one that is currently under way.
2.3.2 The Central Archaeological Council and the Athens Archaeological Society

In addition to the Service, archaeological works are primarily overseen and controlled by the Central Archaeological Council (Kendriko Arhaiologiko Symvoulio; hereafter CAC) as well as the Archaeological Society at Athens (I en Athinais Arhaeiologiki Etaireia: hereafter ASA). As stated on the Council’s website (CAC 2015) the institution was established in 1834, and claims to be “an integral part of the history of the modern Greek state and is inextricably linked to the preservation and promotion of Greece’s cultural heritage”. It acts as the main consultation council for the Service regarding matters of protection, organisation and management of antiquities and consists of a number of academics, heads of central and regional services and the General Secretary of the Ministry. According to CAC, the council receives those case files, which the Ephorates of Antiquities, local councils and the Directorates of the Central Office of the Ministry of Culture “do not have the capability to handle or deliver” (ibid.). The nature of such case files are not made clear, neither is the basis on which capability is defined. The ASA was established in 1837 on the initiative of a wealthy Greek merchant and consisted of scholars and politicians “with the object of locating, re-erecting and restoring the antiquities of Greece” (ASA, n.d.). As Hamilakis (2007a: 62) observes, the ASA was responsible for constructing the classical heritage of Greece by demolishing a number of post-Classical monuments (especially in ‘sacred’ places such as the Acropolis), rebuilding selective monuments and exhibiting of selective, fetishised artifacts of classical antiquity in museums. Here, one clearly becomes aware of a particularly selective process in regards to monuments’ preservation and exhibition. Moreover, it is important to note that today, the ASA is composed of members of the public, “educated people” of the Greek cosmopolitan bourgeoisie (see Hamilakis 2007a: 44), vaguely reminiscent of the Greek elite which facilitated the production of the nation and its imagination in the nineteenth century.

These institutions—both independently, as well as joint ventures—have moulded not only the way archaeology is practiced in the country today, but have also produced perceptions of the past that are prominent in modern Greek society. Most importantly, they have affected the way in which the past is presented at archaeological sites, museums and all levels of education. These representations of the past have been appropriated through various political and social agencies since the creation of the state, shaping both disciplinary practices as well as attitudes and mentalities in the present. The ethnocentric character of these appropriations not only contributed to the Greek national project, but remains persistent today, obstructing other forms of practices and interactions with the past to occur. Official discourses of the archaeological past in Greece have long dominated the unofficial ones, silencing alternative narratives.
2.3.3 Greek Archaeology from Below

What is often overshadowed in the process of nation-building, is the intimate relationship between the local population and antiquities, before the creation of the state and institutionalisation of archaeology. Aggeliki Kokkou’s (1977) elaborate and comprehensive study on the care and preservation of Greek antiquities from the Ottoman occupation of Greece until the 1970s, presents a well-documented account of the lives of Greek antiquities in time. Her discussion on their role in the lives of locals before the establishment of the state is of particular interest, as she asserts that ancient remnants were frequently utilised in diverse ways, incorporated into the locals’ places of worship, homes, and in their everyday lives, giving them life in alternative ways (ibid.: 22-23). This practice, as Kotsakis (1991: 66-67) claims, is a spontaneous prescientific conception of care for antiquities that existed before the administrative elite realised the ideological potential of the ancient past and the establishment of Greek archaeology. Hamilakis (2009: 21) further expands this idea, proposing the existence of an alternative indigenous archaeology, a native form of archaeology involving practices of recovery, care, exhibition and interpretation as well as the reincorporation of antiquities in everyday life. Papalexandrou’s (2003; 2010) work on the incorporation of spolia—fragmented remnants from antiquity—upon Byzantine churches (amongst other buildings), presents a unique paradigm of the care attributed to archaeological remnants by local communities before the establishment of the discipline. Her study presents not only the significations attributed to remnants by the local population at the time, but also the perception of temporality before the imposition of modernist modes and official, systemic procedures. In many ways, my work studies a similar condition through the interaction of local communities with archaeological heritage today, an unofficial, alternative cultural biography of sites overshadowed by the imposition of ‘grander’ narratives and practices.

These bottom-up approaches were also prevalent beyond the material remains of the past, permeating people’s perception of themselves and their sense of identity, as well as their relationship with their environments and with time. This resulted in the reformulation of the externally derived notion of western Hellenism by the Greek intellectuals in order to coincide with the complex, internal social reality of the local society (Hamilakis 2007a: 27, 57-123; 2009). Hamilakis (2007a: 27) suggests a “novel, local synthesis” of an indigenous Hellenism (see also: Hamilakis 2008; 2009), involving the fusion between classical antiquity and the rehabilitation of Byzantium, the latter more familiar to the existing Christian Orthodox population. This hybridity—implemented primarily by the elite but influenced by the indigenous population’s popular beliefs and Christian mentalities (Hamilakis 2009: 22)—enabled the establishment of a cohesive national history, constructing a monumental spatio-temporal topos that allowed the Greeks to imagine time and place in synchronicity. Although not wholly a bottom-up approach, this transition from western to indigenous provided the building blocks of a national identity, which was more ‘at home’. Most importantly, it functioned as a ‘guideline’ for the practice of heritage management by the newly
established Archaeological Service, still in use today. This shift also entailed a ‘constructed-for-outward-consumption’ identity. Herzfeld discusses the paradoxical double image of Greek cultural origins, Romiossini and Ellinismos, the first deriving from the country’s more recent, Christian, Byzantine past whereas the latter from the more distant, pagan, classical past. This dual ancestry—the internal and external respectively—still informs Greeks’ ideals of ‘self-knowledge’ and ‘self-presentation’. This ‘inside/outside’ sense of identity can be seen in various forms of culture within Greece, from the ‘puristic’ (Katharevousa) and demotic forms of language, to the interior/exterior architectural elements of neo-classical buildings—neo-classical facades with simple, village style interiors (Herzfeld 1987: 101-14). By employing this tension, Herzfeld successfully highlights the ambiguity existing between Greeks’ sense of identity internally and externally. Through his work, he emphasises the innate, polarising practices existing within official perspectives of the Greek national past, which systematically dehistoricises its own past selectively while simultaneously decontextualising the present (ibid.: 122).

2.4 Concluding Thoughts

The theoretical, historical and ontological foundations of archaeology and its contemporaneous development with nation states, have played a catalytic role in the disciplinary practices still existing in the present. The use of archaeological heritage as a tool for control, power and legitimisation for the purpose of formulating national identities and narratives still seep through present disciplinary practices and theoretical frameworks. The works of social scientists concerning nationalism were utilised in this chapter to compliment the literature on the entangled relationship between archaeology and nationalism. They reveal the colonial roots of the discipline, the defining crypto-colonialism (Herzfeld 2002) present in the Greek case and the effects of these into producing an archaeology which functions as a colonising mechanism itself. They constitute an outline of the theories which have guided my work, with a particular focus on the elements which concern the public and the local. The perspectives offered provide a theoretical and historical framework that speaks to the general processes and circumstances enabling antiquities to become a central focus in the construction of national identity and narrative. Moreover, they allow for a better understanding of the institutional, hegemonic structures which shaped the disciplinary practices of archaeology and still exist in a number of countries, obstructing archaeologies from below to flourish and contribute to the archaeological record. The dominance of standardised, homogenous forms of culture for political legitimacy is central to my study as it presents the durability of the practice from the creation of the Greek nation-state all the way to the present, overlooking the idiosyncrasies of localities and their relationship to tangible heritage and their forms of in/tangible culture.

Disciplinary practices and the formation of ‘subfields’ such as public, community and indigenous archaeology, have gone a long way into decolonising and decontextualising official, modernist
practices established in the past. These efforts have honed interdisciplinary methods and strategies in an effort to make archaeology more accessible and relevant to present sociocultural, political and economic contexts. The multiplicity of methodologies, as well as the intentional broad definitions of various forms of social archaeology, represent the diversity of heritage, publics and strategies involved. These further reflect the significance of the particularity of each ‘case study’ and the necessity of approaching each both from a broader scope, but more importantly through their specific contexts and circumstances.

In the Greek case, the role of antiquities and archaeology in national imagination still hinders the interaction between archaeology and the public to a great extent. The centrality of heritage and the past in the Greek national narrative and sense of identity still looms over the operation of disciplinary practices. Exclusive state control over Greek heritage has greatly impeded the sociality of archaeology to materialise within this context, especially in the Athenian urban setting, which acts as a prominent symbolic capital of the nation’s past. Anastasia Sakellariadi’s (2010) study on the prospect of applying methods utilised in community archaeology in Greece, comprehensively explains the ways in which such a practice could potentially be considered a ‘threat’ to the state’s exclusive rights and authority over archaeological resources. She justifiably affirms that community archaeology would challenge the national, homogenised past, and transform the country’s symbolic capital to a social capital—one that would decolonise and Greek culture’s “eclectic bond with the west” (ibid.: 523). Her work effectively presents the ideological, political and practical hindrances which have sustained a gap between Greek archaeology and the public in the past, as well as in the present.

The two archaeological parks studied for the purposes of this thesis represent optimum locations for the application of public archaeology, benefiting both the local population in regards to their access and further exploration of the spaces, but also the archaeological community which would have an opportunity to re-discover the parks through the residents’ daily contact with and care of these.
Chapter 3  Identity, Temporality and Space in the Neoliberal Age

The extensive literature on the concepts of identity, temporality, and space—both as independent notions as well as in conjunction with one another—demonstrates their depth, complexity, and their fluid nature. Scholarly reassessment and reflection on the specific themes are based on the constant shifts observed in society, the altering perceptions which coincide with historical changes, and the perpetual embeddedness of modernity. What position do these concepts occupy in the neoliberal context? How have the rapid political changes affected localities within an increasingly globalising world, and how are archaeological sites situated within these transitions?

This chapter provides a critical overview of selected theoretical discourses that provide the ontological underpinning of the present research. The following review of these concepts is divided into interconnected sections, showing their linked palpability. As such, the selected approaches enable an understanding of the broader social, political, and economic milieus of the present, the dialectical global/local nexus, and the oscillating relationship between national and local identity. This chapter further investigates the effects of neoliberal governance with respect to the use of public space, and the position of archaeological sites located in urban environments. It considers the political dimensions of archaeology in a modern setting, exploring processes which have contributed to the commodification and commercialisation of sites in the interest—primarily—of capitalist endeavours. Last, this chapter provides a view of the present Greek reverberations of the crisis on a sociopolitical level, particularly in relation to the spatial reconfigurations, the intensification of urban activism, and the role of archaeological sites within this framework.

3.1  Identity

One of the most influential studies I read as an undergraduate student was Roxane Caftanzoglou’s “In the Shadow of the Sacred Rock: Contrasting Discourses of Place under the Acropolis” (2001). Caftanzoglou, a social anthropologist, studies the “contrasting representations and uses of place” (ibid.: 21) through the case of the Anafiotika settlement located beneath the ‘Sacred Rock’—the Athenian Acropolis. She discusses the opposing discourses existing between the Archaeological Service and the local community, the former characterised by a “hegemonic vision of time and space” which gives priority to antiquity, and the latter emphasising “the local and the vernacular” (ibid.: 22). The centrality of Athens and its classical past in the late nineteenth century prompted the Archaeological Service and prominent scholars of the time to describe the settlement as an undesirable sight, a “disorderly and polluting irruption of social time” (ibid.: 24), disturbing the
purity and prominence of the Athenian Acropolis. In its long and turbulent history, the settlement has been excluded from maps, experienced demolitions and expropriations by state authorities, with residents consistently being restricted by the Service from restoring their homes (ibid.: 26-29). Caftanzoglou views these interventions and restrictions placed on lived space by state authorities as a successful curtailing of the social reproduction of an entire community, encouraging the latter to construct:

“a counter-discourse of space, time and history based on shared collective and individual memories that have been fundamental in creating a ‘community of participation’ and enabling them to develop and sustain a sense of distinct cultural identity.”

(Caftanzoglou 2001: 29)

The contested nature of the space—its monumentalisation, the deliberate practices of exclusion and destruction, the conflicting official and extra-official heritage discourses as well as repeated clashes between state services and the community, strengthened the latter’s sense of belonging and rootedness. The settlement’s spatial, temporal and historical marginalisation reinforces the community’s local memory and sense of identity. It informs the dynamics between national and local identity—most noticeably their uneven interplay—and the gradual solidification of local identity formation resulting from a sense of difference with hegemonic structures, as well as a sense of similarity amongst the community.

Caftanzoglou’s study on the conflicting uses and significations attributed to space shares four key elements with my own research. First, she addresses the enduring prominence ascribed to classical heritage and mega-sites such as the Acropolis in relation to other archaeological sites. This dichotomy renders the latter as a “matter out of place” (ibid.: 24-25), whose existence ‘pollutes’ the significance and hegemony of the former. In the case of Philopappou, it is not the space per se which is ‘disturbing’ the Sacred Rock, but the local communities and their reclamations of the hill. Therefore, this thesis explores the unequal dynamics existing between national and local narratives and degrees of identity. A second key feature of Caftanzoglou’s study is the practices of exclusion that have strengthened the community’s sense of identity and of belonging. It embodies the multiplicity of practical issues and imbalances existing between communities and state services. Third, it communicates the significance of the elements of similarity and identification, which further unite the community and bring its individual members closer to one another. Last, it speaks to the significance of place and the public sphere, which will be further explored in the following sections.

Caftanzoglou’s study approaches the concepts of identity, culture and place through the paradigm of a small neighbourhood located within the fabric of a superimposed national framework and a globalising world, by successfully highlighting the importance of human activity and agency in the
production of place. She deviates from current anthropological studies which deconstruct the fixed association between identity, culture and place due to mass migration, displacement and deterritorialisation in today’s globalising world (cf. Gupta and Ferguson 1997: 1-6; Lovell 1998: 1-24) by demonstrating how the active involvement of social groups in constructing and defending “rootedness and belonging, ways of life, realities and senses of place, boundaries that certify and maintain distinctiveness” offers a way of overcoming “methodological and conceptual tensions between totally ‘unhooking’ identity and culture from place and constructing them as place-bound” (Caftanzoglou 2001: 21). This is not to say however that locality and belonging as markers of identity have not been affected by globalisation, neoliberalism and capitalism as seen in the last decades, but that the prevailing significance of the reflexive relationship between identity and locality is of higher importance here.

The peculiar case of the Anafiotika settlement has been a milestone case study that always comes to mind when considering the diverse matters concerning local communities neighbouring archaeological sites, especially within the multitemporal Athenian context. In particular, it has operated as a form of benchmark study through which the varying degrees of contention represented in the multileveled elements constituting the localities and spaces I have researched. More importantly, it acts as a point of reference in regards to the politics of identity as it provides an almost tangible paradigm to an abstract notion. Despite the fact that the Anafiotika community is significantly different from the localities neighbouring Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy—the history of the district goes back to immigrant workers from the Cycladic island of Anafi who came to Athens in the mid-nineteenth century—matters of difference/exclusion and identification are relevant in a number of heterogeneous communities dealing with state services for the protection of archaeological and public spaces.

In regards to difference and exclusionary practices, this thesis adopts cultural theorist Stuart Hall’s perspective in perceiving the concept of identity within contemporary society. Drawing from the works of Foucault, Laclau, Butler and Althusser, Hall (1996: 4) stresses that identities “emerge within the play of specific modalities of power, and thus are more the product of the marking of difference and exclusion...constructed through, not outside, difference”. He extends his argument beyond traditional conceptualisations of identity which relate to sameness and unity amongst individuals of a particular society, claiming that modern historical circumstances and hegemonic structures have prompted for identities to form within processes of exclusion and through difference. Hall addresses the fragmented and fractured nature of identities, most importantly claiming that they are:

“...never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic discourses, practices and positions. They are subject to a radical historicization, and are constantly in the process of change and transformation.”

(Hall 1996: 4)
He urges us to situate discussions regarding identity within contemporary historical developments and practices, particularly in the context of the processes of globalisation, which have contributed to a shift in relatively ‘settled’ forms of identity in various populations and cultures. He further discusses the fluidity of identities and the importance of history, language and culture in the active process that is identity; “the process of becoming rather than being: not ‘who we are’ or ‘where we came from’, so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves” (1996: 4). The active nature that Hall ascribes to identity allows for flexibility not only in the re-conceptualisation and re-articulation of the concept, but in the active process of ‘identification’—a term that Hall prefers as opposed to ‘identity’ (ibid.: 2).

A distinctly alternative approach is offered by sociologist Richard Jenkins. He suggests that “all human identities are, by definition social identities”, asserting that “identifying ourselves, or others, is a matter of meaning, and meaning always involves interaction: agreement and disagreement, convention and innovation, communication and negotiation” (Jenkins 2008: 17). He therefore defines identity as the “ways in which individuals and collectivities are distinguished in their relations with other individuals and collectivities” (ibid.: 18). In addressing ‘identification’, Jenkins draws from the works of Karl Marx and Georg Simmel, in that relationships of similarity and difference are important in the systematic establishment of signification between individuals, collectivities and amongst the former and the latter. He therefore concludes that similarity and difference, entangled by default, “are the dynamic principles of identification, and are at the heart of the human world” (ibid.: 18). Furthermore, Jenkins follows the path of prominent social theorists asserting that identity is not fixed, immutable or primordial, emphasising its socio-cultural origins and its ability to be flexible and negotiable (ibid.: 19). Nevertheless, he approaches identity and identification with a clear scepticism towards contemporary social theorists, which emphasise the pre-eminence of difference (ibid.: 18-27). He argues that difference alone is not enough to establish “who’s who”, and that ultimately it cannot provide a proper account of “how it is that we know who’s who, or what’s what” in society (ibid.: 22-23). Most importantly, in terms of collective mobilisation, he asserts that similarity and difference should be thought about together as they both provide a sense of shared pursuit and objectives in collective politics and imaginings when fighting for social change (ibid.: 24).

The antithesis between Hall’s and Jenkins’ approaches to the concept of identity primarily lies in the fact that Hall views identity as a matter of “considerable political significance” (1996: 16), whereas Jenkins asserts that political rhetoric and theory, despite the heavily politicised contemporary phenomena, is not a task social scientists should be obliged to undertake (2008: 8). Despite leaning towards Hall’s view on identity and identification, particularly regarding the political dimension which characterises the active and organic nature of identity—especially within the context of today’s rapidly changing world—I also agree with Jenkins’s argument of maintaining a balance between similarity and difference. This is to say that although it is indeed
important—in fact, necessary—to be able to identify points of departure, it is equally as important to recognise shared elements and commonalities. Methodologically, by combining the two theories, my thesis views Jenkins’ approach as a more intimate form of identity, an ‘internal’ one which shares both similarities and differences amongst collectivities and sense of place, and Hall’s view as an ‘external’ force—one that allows communities to differentiate themselves from institutions and state services which impose their policies and reconfigurations in their environments.

### 3.2 Temporality

The human perception of time, the social organisation of the concept, and its entanglement with societies and space has formed an extensive discourse approached through various perspectives, theoretical viewpoints and fields. The diversity of these discussions consists of concepts such as “chronotopes”, representing the temporal and spatial connections expressed in literature (Bakhtin 1981), the phenomenological and existentialist approach to Being and its rootedness in temporality (Heidegger 1962), and the intuitive yet inexpressible qualitative multiplicity of duration within the human experience of time (Bergson 1991). These works reflect on the human experiential and affective understanding of time, the interconnectedness of self-perception and consciousness temporally and spatially, and the ability to distinguish multiplicity beyond Cartesian linearity and fixity.

Situating my research within this time-space discursive nexus, my first encounter is with Tim Ingold’s (1993) canonical theory on the temporality of the landscape through which the author describes what he views as the point of contact between archaeology and anthropology. Ingold (ibid.: 152) argues that since human life involves the passage of time and the formation of lived places, thus time and landscape acquire a unifying function which goes beyond “sterile” views of both elements. As such, it allows landscapes to be viewed through the “dwelling perspective” (ibid.); a living testament of those that have experienced them as part of their journey and have inevitably left a part of themselves within these spaces, through time. The character and uniqueness of a landscape is attributed to the significations it gathers through the experiences and social interactions of people with it—through the engagement of their sensory faculties within a given landscape (ibid.: 155). Ingold (ibid.: 157) clarifies that the idea of temporality within this given landscape is not a measure of chronology or history, but rather a parallel entity with historicity which together enable the advancement of the “process of social life” through activities which he refers to as “taskscapes”.

Ingold therefore views these taskscapes as an ensemble of tasks performed in a variety of temporal means—parallel, in a series, etc.—which in an analogous manner to the array of related feature which constitute a landscape, compose an array of related activities (ibid.: 158). The phenomenological essence of his thesis is encapsulated in his analogy between an orchestral
performance and social life as a reflection of the temporality of the taskscape; it is through “the network of interrelationships between the multiple rhythms of which the taskscape itself is constituted” (ibid.: 160). Similarly, the temporalisation of the landscape is represented through the act of performance, exemplified in the analogy of the act of painting—the landscape is always a ‘work in progress’ and is epitomised by the constant movement it embodies (ibid.: 162). Ingold’s work allows for a theoretical framework to approach tangible and intangible elements we experience habitually on a daily basis. His conceptualisation allows for a multisensory perception of our surroundings and our place in them, the way we engage with our environment and the never-ending ‘performances’ of our day to day social lives in relation to others, within a landscape and within time. It enables an alternative perception of time and place, one that does not align with Western-imposed chronological modes and perceptions. His ideas echo Fabian’s (1983) distinction between anthropology’s temporal and spatial synchronicity with its object of study, and the denial of coevalness—the co-existence of the anthropologist with the interlocutor in the same time. Fabian (ibid.: 82-93) suggests a reflexive, hermeneutic interaction between the two, in an effort to avoid allochronic subjectivities. He advocates for the sense of shared, intersubjective time as a necessary condition of communication (ibid.: 42) which allows anthropological endeavours to co-exist temporally and spatially.

Herzfeld’s (1991) thesis on social and monumental time is also of relevance here, particularly in regards to the link between the materiality of antiquities and temporality. He discusses the chasm between social and monumental time which ultimately “separates popular from official understanding of history” (ibid.: 10). Herzfeld asserts that social time captures the intricacies of everyday experience, giving events a sense of reality, whereas monumental time is “reductive and generic…encounter[ing] events as realisations of some supreme destiny”, reducing thus social experiences to “collective predictability” (ibid.). The monumentalisation of time through the significations attributed to archaeological monuments and sites by official, hegemonic structures, often supersedes social time and the relationship between materiality and everyday life. It imposes a modernist conception of time which adheres to linearity and restricts our perception of it. Bergson (1991: 34, 57) thus proposes an alternative understanding of time, emphasising our sensorial, affective and experiential qualities combined with the prolonging nature of memory—allowing for past and present moments to overlap into another and coexist, creating thus “a plurality of moments”. Bergson creates a link between matter and temporality through duration, one which enables for multitemporal and multisensorial interactions with the material world. As such, the multitemporality of objects, their reactivation and re-appropriation through human social practices, and their ability to enact and evoke different times simultaneously, allows them to embody—both materially and physically, memory as duration (Hamilakis and Labanyi 2008: 6).

Charles Stewart further offers an interesting perspective on the cultural perceptions of the past, through his alternative analysis of the concept of historicity within the discipline of anthropology.
Like Ingold, his work focuses on the phenomenological and affective relationship between people and the past, countering linear approaches to the past associated with Western historicism. He asserts that historicity is grounded on the notion of temporality, representing the “relationship to the past that individuals establish, given their present position (and intimations of the future) and the models available to them” (Stewart 2016: 80 cf. Hirsch and Stewart 2005; Ballard 2014; Hartog 2015). Stewart argues that anthropological endeavours have often overshadowed coevalness of multiple temporalities within societies and everyday life (ibid.: 84 cf. Bloch 1998; Birth 2008; Hamilakis and Theou 2013), admitting nonetheless that achieving coevalness is a difficult task within the hierarchical time perspective of Western historicism.

With these concepts at hand, this research further seeks to understand the multi-layered cultural and social perceptions of time and space in the present neoliberal context. How does the perception of our environs and time change during a crisis?

Knight and Stewart’s (2016) edited volume of ethnographies during times of austerity provide studies from Southern Europe and the effects of the crisis in the affective perception of temporality. Their work discusses the altering relationship to time stimulated by the increase of social suffering, insecurity, and material poverty (ibid.: 2). Most importantly, they demonstrate how the current crisis has instigated a perplex entanglement between temporal and affective modes—“past, present and future ambitions, hopes, failures, financial capacities, and political rhetorics” (cf. Knight 2012; 2015) through which people attempt to make sense and cope with current conditions. Effectively, the rupture in people’s everyday lives and realities has prompted a process of condensing temporal moments (Knight and Stewart 2016: 4)—looking into the past to understand what has brought on these changes, what the future holds for them, and what they can do presently. It is discernible from Stewart and Knight’s thesis, as well as the studies presented in their volume, that this fusion of time combined with frustration and anxiety often leads to the need to make sense of these conditions in diverse ways, whether through the archiving of material evidence (Alexandrakis 2016), performance (Gray 2016), re-interpretations of land (Vournelis 2016), or through the claiming/reclamation of public space and/or archaeological parks as seen through the present research.
3.3 Space

“...space [is] the product of interrelations; as constituted through interactions, from the immensity of the global to the intimately tiny...we understand space as contemporaneous plurality; as the sphere in which distinct trajectories coexist; as the sphere therefore coexisting heterogeneity. Without space, no multiplicity; without multiplicity, no space. If space is indeed the product of interrelations, then it must be predicated upon the existence of plurality. Multiplicity and space as co-constitutive...space [is] always under construction. Precisely because space on this reading is a product of relations-between, relations which are necessarily embedded material practices which have to be carried out, it is always in the process of being made. It is never finished; never closed. Perhaps we could imagine space as a simultaneity of stories-so-far.”

(Massey 2005: 9)

Doreen Massey’s interpretation of space captures the spirit of the present research. Her work argues for the active nature of space, one that does not have a single identity but multiple ones, constantly in motion—beyond restrictions of modernist perceptions of time. For Massey (2005: 55), space is always in process, encapsulating the coexistence of multiple temporal trajectories, social relations and material practices, one that favours “dynamic simultaneity” over “static contemporaneity”. Her work goes beyond hegemonic constructions of space which, as a consequence of restricting its temporal dynamic, alters its representation and by extension our affective relationship with it and our perception of it. Like Hall, she urges for a re-evaluation of space within the context of globalisation—one that supersedes modernist conceptions, one that critiques and decentralises the European trajectory, and allows for the imagination of space through multiple trajectories. In a similar manner to Ingold, she argues that the historically significant way of imagining space has reinforced a solidified understanding of it, defined by a lack of temporality and contributing substantially to its continuing to be thought of in that way (ibid.: 28). Massey further emphasises the sense of space as one that is not only defined by human sociability, but also through the sense of engagement within a multiplicity (ibid.: 61).

A similar yet theoretically alternative approach to space is offered by geographer Yi-Fu Tuan, who views ‘space’ as a more abstract notion than ‘place’ (2001: 6). He asserts that the two concepts have a co-dependent relationship as they require one another in order to be defined, noting that if we “think of space as that which allows movement, then place is pause; each pause in movement makes it possible for location to be transformed into place” (ibid.). Through his approach, Tuan views space as the place that has been charged with meaning and experiences by people. Like Massey, he discusses how space is linked to movement, however denoting a more defined and delineated social construction of space through the connection of places, or ‘pauses’; social and
cultural geographer Tim Cresswell (2004: 10) concurs, asserting “when humans invest meaning in a portion of space and then become attached to it in some way…it becomes a place”. Similarly and through a more politically attuned standpoint, for social theorist and geographer David Harvey (1996: 293), “place, in whatever guise, is like space and time, a social construct”. He discusses the multiple dimensions/loci and constructions of place through its interconnectedness with space and time, exploring its diverse significations in social, political and spatial practices. Harvey’s approach on space—as well as the social, political and economic processes associated with spatial justice—draws heavily from the works of philosopher and sociologist, Henri Lefebvre. In his seminal work, *The Production of Space* (1991 [1974]), Lefebvre presents a conceptual triad that includes spatial practice, representations of space and representational spaces, through which he argues the socially produced nature of space. Through spatial practice, Lefebvre focuses on production and reproduction and the “particular locations and spatial sets characteristic of each social formation” (ibid.: 33). It is through the spatial practice of a society that a space is produced, a “dialectical interaction” between society and space (ibid.: 38). These are the everyday routines and patterns of the members within a society, the daily social activities within a lived space. Moreover, through representations of space, Lefebvre considers those that affect the conceptualisation of space: “scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers…all of whom identify what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived”, meaning those that work towards formulating “a system of verbal (and therefore intellectually worked out) signs” (ibid.). The conceptualisation of space by these particular members of society organise the practical aspects of space which ultimately also affect spatial relations. Finally, representational spaces focuses on the “inhabitants” and “users” of space, of artists, writers and others and the way they seek, through their imagination, to change and appropriate space (ibid.: 39). These spaces ‘overlay’ physical space and are charged with symbolisms by those who attribute alternative meanings to spaces.

### 3.3.1 Heterotopias and the Public Sphere

Representational spaces charged with symbolism and meaning can take multiple forms. For Foucault (1984), heterotopias are places that exist and are formed in the very founding of society, which simultaneously represent, contest, and invert real places that exist within society, but are beyond the reach of our everyday reality, despite their existence and visibility. They are spaces that are charged with meaning for society, possess a form of sacredness, however function “outside of all places” (1984: 47), creating a sense of “otherness”. They “presuppose a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable… [they are] not freely accessible like a public space. Either the entry is compulsory...or else the individual has to submit to rites and purifications” (ibid.: 49). Through his approach, he presents a set of relations between society heterotopias. These exist in all societies but take varied forms at different times, functioning in ways that accord to cultures in given moments in time. The element of time is also important as it
defines “heterochronies”, the moment traditional time ‘breaks’, therefore enabling the accumulation of time, but existing beyond it. My thesis views archaeological sites officially enclosed by state services as heterotopias; they are spaces confined, demarcated and frozen in time within a hegemonic context, which does not allow them to exist in synchrony with society. They are juxtaposed to spaces that are used in people’s everyday lives, and yet are inaccessible to them. They are perceived as ‘sacred’ places that embody the nation’s imaginings with highly charged significations, much like places of worship that should not be ‘tainted’ by the present (much like in the case of the Anafiotika). This sanctification further creates a distance and sense of mystification as opposed to the real, lived spaces surrounding them.

The concept of heterotopias is one that is abstract and not absolute—although it does deal with physical spaces charged with societal values and ideals—and can therefore be imagined and applied in various ways. In his re-conceptualisation of Foucault’s theory in the present context, Cenzatti (2008: 77) views modern heterotopias as ‘other places’, often created by “the top-down making of places of exclusion”. He discusses the multiplicity of changing spaces through what he calls “heterotopias of difference” (ibid.: 79), claiming that irreconcilable spaces are constantly contested and shifting, thus fluctuating between contradiction and expression, invisibility and recognition. Drawing on Harvey and Lefebvre’s work, Cenzatti (ibid. 81) accentuates the social relations marked by difference, which take place in different instances and producing different “lived moments”; “different spaces of representation” which attribute powerful meanings to physical spaces.

Cenzatti’s thesis refers to elements from Habermas’s (1989: 27) concept of the public sphere, another form of representational space which enables for “private people [to] come together as a public”. Within this space, people can actively engage in “articulating the needs of society with the state” (ibid.: 176). According to Habermas, the participatory democratic processes defined in the rational-critical dialogues amongst citizens, allows for the regulation of the state and the generation of public opinion which would ideally facilitate a relative balance between authority and the public. Nevertheless, he identifies the deterioration of the public sphere through the advancement of “privileged private interests” which inevitably “invaded the public sphere” (ibid.: 185).

Habermas’s work has received extensive criticism, primarily for his failure to address women’s discrimination in his historical recount of the formation of the public sphere (Fraser 1990), as well as his attempt to create an “all-inclusive democratic public arena” (Cenzatti 2008: 82), which would further alienate marginalised individuals having to conceal their differences so as to participate in an all-encompassing public sphere (Warner 1992). Despite its flaws, Habermas’s conception of the public sphere can be considered a tangible entity, one that creates a space through which people feel empowered to participate in public debates and the formation of opinions, allowing thus for the physical manifestation of “heterotopias of difference”.
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3.3.2 The Right to the City and Urban Activism

In *Writings on Cities* (1996 [1968]: 147), Lefebvre discusses the diverse social needs of human beings in the city, “the need for security and opening...of organization of work and play...of similarity and difference, of isolation and encounter, exchange and investments, of independence (even solitude) and communication...to see, to hear, to touch, to taste and the need to gather these perceptions in a ‘world’”. In doing so, he highlights the importance of “creative activity” in an environment that is not imposed by “commercial and cultural infrastructures...places where exchange would not go through exchange value, commerce and profit” (ibid.: 147-148). Lefebvre argues for the right to freedom, of socialisation of society and the right of participation and appropriation in the city, a right that “can only be formulated as a transformed and renewed right to urban life” (ibid.: 157-174). Harvey extends Lefebvre’s idea by proposing that the right to the city is ultimately the right to “change ourselves by changing the city” (2008: 315; see also Harvey 2012). He emphasises the collective rather than individual nature of the right in order to reshape the process of urbanisation. Writing during the initial stages of the global financial crisis, he urges the unification of social movements globally to democratise control over production and utilisation of surplus—since the urban process is a major channel of surplus use—and institute new modes of urbanisation (Harvey 2008: 315-324). His idea of the right to the city therefore requires the democratic management over urban deployment, which in turn would allow the people a type of control which they have been denied for so long.

Both Lefebvre and Harvey insist on urban revolution as a way to reclaim basic rights within our urban surroundings in the context of an increasingly neoliberalising world. Anthropologist and political activist David Graeber does just that, reflecting on the democracy ‘project’ and the need for “free people to be able to sit down together like reasonable adults and govern their own affairs” (2013: xiv) through his own personal experiences and involvement. He proposes that people take matters in their own hands, utilising the qualities of a direct democracy “that actually could operate within self-governing communities outside of any state” (2013: 89). A project as such would demonstrate the contagious nature of faith and freedom, necessary to enable change and motivate people to see what “politics...or human life, could actually be like” (ibid.). Through his integral participation in the Occupy Wall Street movement, Graeber examines the basic components in creating change, underlining the significance of creating a consensus through which members of a movement establish horizontal organisational processes in order to enable decision-making (2013: 210-220).
3.4 Archaeology and Neoliberalism

So where does archaeology stand within this context? How do present practices fit in today’s globalised world, and how has neoliberal governance affected archaeological sites and our contact with them? Most importantly, how have the effects of a globalised realm subsequently affected our concept of identity, temporality, and space in regards to archaeological sites?

Resco (2016: 4) argues that both in practice and within the cultural framework, the consequences of neoliberal thinking and governance have created a mentality revolving around purchase and sale of products, justified by the need for growth, profitability and progression during a time of economic recession. Garcia (2016: 19) expands this idea drawing from the works of Harvey (2009), suggesting that within the cycle of neoliberal hegemony, state action combined with socioeconomic pressures—in many parts of the world—have created a market almost exclusively dependent on the state. Garcia (2016: 21-27) further supports that the relationship between archaeology and neoliberalism is preceded by the association of the discipline with capitalism. He distinguishes archaeology’s involvement in the processes of value production and capital accumulation, reverberating Shanks’s and Tilley’s (1987: 62) assertion that “a great deal of archaeology is ideological practice, practice which sustains and justifies a capitalist present.”

More relevant to the present study, Garcia (2016: 22) affirms the discipline’s progressive involvement in fields relating directly to productive economy, such as urbanisation, infrastructure and management of cultural resources, which have presently resulted in archaeology composing a direct agent of productive and economic activity. Haber (2016: 158-159) concurs, claiming that archaeology is included within schemes which modulate capitalist expansion, leading to—amongst others—territorial interventions. These interventions do not take local territorial arrangements into consideration, leading Haber to the conclusion that “development is the current orientation of hegemonic time” (ibid.).

This shift and increasingly stronger connection between archaeology and capitalist/neoliberal modes of operation has further prompted the re-evaluation of priorities on what to investigate and how research is carried out (Torija 2016: 81). For this reason, Hamilakis (2007b: 24-25) urges for the adoption of a threefold political ethic—one that reminds archaeologists to prioritise their social and political identities over their professional one when action is necessary; to extend beyond fetishised notions of the archaeological record; and to consistently address the political dimensions both within the discipline and outside. Amongst others, this principle of political ethic can act as an effective way for the discipline to actively disengage from its involvement in neoliberal and capitalist means of production which aggressively commodifies archaeological heritage at the expense of communities. In a similar vein, archaeologist Randall McGuire (2008) advocates for political praxis within the discipline, one that is characterised by transformative, collective action and calls for emancipatory practices in the midst of fast capitalism.
Moreover, another repercussion of the connection between archaeology and neoliberalism has been the systematic changes in policies by regulating procedures and making them more lax (Torija 2016: 81) so as to remove potential obstacles in neoliberal undertakings. Apaydin’s (2016) study on the effects of development megaprojects in rural and urban sites of archaeological heritage in Turkey, represents a prime example of neoliberal policies affecting and threatening—and even taking—people’s lives. Amongst others, he refers to the case of the Gezi Park protest as a response to state plans to convert Taksim Square into a shopping mall, leading to a local and eventually national uprising involving demonstrations against government corruption and injustices, also resulting in the deaths of protesters (cf. Tastan and Ete 2014). In the same year, Park Güell in Barcelona was threatened to be privatised by the imposition of an entrance fee for segments of the park containing Gaudi’s work, regulating thus the number of visitors per day and of opening hours (Plataforma Defensem el Park Güell 2012). Resident mobilisation followed—despite residents having free access through a personalised entrance card (The Municipality of Barcelona, n.d.)—claiming that the park should be open to all and that privatisation would set a precedent (Plataforma Defensem el Park Güell 2012). Both Park Güell and Taksim Square—beyond their numerous differences—have acted as spaces of heritage uniting residents and civilians against an array of political, social and economic injustices in the neoliberal age.

From an anthropological perspective, archaeology’s place in the world today shares a number of parallels with colonialist and imperialist practices of the—not so distant after all—past. Herzfeld’s (2002) theory of crypto-colonialism reveals comparable circumstances to the colonial tendencies of yore through the imposition of neoliberal economics, policies and transitions. In addition to the extensive resemblances between the economic and cultural subjugation of Greece and Thailand to Western models (2002), Herzfeld (2009) more recently explores the gentrification and commercialisation of the historic district of Monti in Rome, the effects of globalisation and the changes in economic, social and political spheres and the effort—within this context—to consolidate national identity through the construction of heritage. This study shares close similarities to various localities within Athens, which have also endured excessive reconfigurations as a result of neoliberal processes. Much like Monti, the changes in urban design in Athens “serve the goals of neoliberal modernity” (Herzfeld 2010: 259), that is, monumentalising certain parts of the city that are deemed integral in sustaining a national identity at the expense of civilians who suffer; in many cases this leads to privatisation of public spaces, gentrification of neighbourhoods and even citizens’ dispossession and dislocation.
3.4.1 Sensorial Archaeology/Archaeology of the Senses

“It’s never too late when you don’t know what time it is.”

(Pellini 2016: 239)

Pellini’s frustration with modern capitalism and its rapid rhythms through the imposition of controlled and predetermined time, has lead him to re-evaluate both his intimate involvement with the world, but also his personal participation in archaeological processes. He prompts the reader to go beyond an archaeology without the senses resulting from the anaesthetic aura of capitalism, creating thus an interesting channel through which archaeology’s modernist bounds can be challenged, bringing to the fore its sensorial and affective quality. In more recent years, a number of studies have emerged focusing on the “incorporation of a sensory approach into mainstream archaeology” (Day 2013: 20). Through her research at the Peruvian site of Chavín de Huántar, Weismantel (2013: 131) argues that archaeological procedures involving line drawings, maps, and plans are indeed a necessary tool in practice, but there are material aspects of sites and artifacts that cannot be captured by these tools. She proposes for a sensory interface between the human body and archaeological spaces which will focus on data that often goes unnoticed and remains overlooked. As for re-creating sensory experiences to understand their breadth and how they might have been experienced sensorially and affectively by people in the past, Weddle’s (2013: 156) study on blood sacrifices in the Roman imperial cult proves that despite not being able to fully replicate the exact circumstances, the practice allows for a more nuanced understanding of the processes and meanings of the sacrifices.

Recent approaches in archaeology of the senses have provided an innovative way to understand the archaeological record from alternative perspectives and how people may have engaged with and understood their surroundings in the past (Mills 2014: 20). Robin Skeates’s (2010) work on understanding Maltese prehistory through a sensoriality was achieved (among others) through the practice of reflexivity—going beyond sensory biases which are inherent in Western modalities/perceptions and by extension in research; through experimentation—conducting multisensory fieldwork in order to better comprehend the diverse variables of sensory orders in different locations; through thick description—an attempt to understand the significations attributed to sensory resources in the past through the act of describing our own experiences of similar practices; and through creative writing—utilising imaginative ways of writing so as to engage diverse thoughts and emotions associated with the senses in past ways of life (ibid.: 5-8). Similarly, Hamilakis’s (2013) work on the archaeology of the senses through human experience, memory and affect proposes for a “sensory engagement with the material world” beyond the confines of the discipline, providing thus a “key experiential mode for the generation and activation of bodily memory” (ibid.: 6). His work demonstrates how the sensorial bounds of Western modernity have played a restrictive role in our holistic engagement with the world, and
proposes for the reactivation of our bodily senses. He argues that through our submersion in our senses’ “corporeal nature, their unpredictability, their unruly, anarchic tendencies” (ibid.: 55) it is possible to reconnect with the very nature of what it means to be human. As such, it further enables a more attuned reception of the multi-sensoriality and multi-temporality of archaeological heritage, allowing for a full engagement with potential past ways of life beyond colonialist, nationalist, and capitalist modes, practices and interpretations.

3.5 The Greek Reality Today: A Social, Political, and Economic Crisis

The eruption of the economic crisis in Greece in 2008 altered both the economic stability of the country, as well as its social and political condition. This is not to say however, that there was not a plethora of movements that functioned before the crisis began. Urban mobilisation and social movement organisation was already underway from the late 1990’s and early 2000’s when the country was preparing to host the Athens 2004 Olympic Games (Petropoulou et al. 2016: 44). It was during this time that a new type of state intervention operated in favour of large, private corporations, both through the increase of excessive privatisation plans or through the mixed public-private domain, imposing neoliberal policies that functioned against social interest (ibid.).

The financial crisis only added to the already increasing number of such groups and initiatives, adding more causes and issues that citizens feel the need to deal with first-hand. This section reviews works on the nature of neoliberalism and its effects on the Athenian urban matrix, as well as the concept of the right to the city and the associated motivation for urban activism. They inform the broader context of urban and residential activism in the Greek capital and its relation to archaeological heritage, presenting the social, political and economic characteristics of the contemporary issues diverse forms of urban and social movements are faced with.

3.5.1 Neoliberalism and Urban Re-development

“Facilitating investments, privatisations and disposessions have always been central features of neoliberalism. Yet, in the context of the current crisis in Southern Europe, we can observe the persistence of an aggressive neoliberalism that steps upon the ‘emergency’ of the crisis to directly link the notion of the “public good” with the repayment of public debt. In this context, cities and urban land become privileged terrains for implementing relevant policies and measures. There is a coercive push for rapidly privatizing and/or selling state property and infrastructure, for increased deregulation of planning and weakening of public control, as well as for the development of mega-projects. These measures tend to be part of broader urban development agendas that are presented as “the” solution despite being strongly rooted in neoliberal doctrines, which themselves are causal factors for the current crisis. Against these rapid transformations, forms
of resistance are emerging as well as efforts for challenging dominant growth models and establishing alternative practices of urban development.”

(Encounter Athens 2013)⁴

Essentially, what has been witnessed in Greece in recent years and is still in the process of manifestation is a vicious cycle; the very policies and developments that brought about the crisis in the first place are ‘tended’ to with additional forms of governance of the same kind, creating inescapable and unbearable circumstances. Within this context, rapid privatisations and the sale of state property create both the violent decrease of public spaces and the reproduction of inequalities throughout the social fabric. These practices of exclusion therefore, have given rise to urban movements, in order to deal with the severe transformations to the city, public space and the social sphere, causing ‘multileveled’ crises both on personal and local levels.

The changes imposed upon urban infrastructures for the benefit of capitalist and neoliberal schemes have been extensively discussed by Harvey, whose work has contributed significantly to the establishment of a more critical and politically attuned discipline of geography, particularly through a Marxist theoretical and methodological approach. His studies on the effects of globalisation and neoliberalism, the uneven geographical development of capitalism and the resulting social injustices have extensively stimulated and influenced my work (see especially Harvey’s work in 2000; 2008; 2009). More specifically, Harvey reflects on the social and spatial dynamics of society, considering the politics of environmental and social justice in an effort to explore alternative approaches to political, economic and ecological issues facing contemporary society (1996). Furthermore, he analyses fundamental issues in urbanisation, particularly through urban policies and planning, revealing the unbalanced relationship existing between social justice and space (2009), and proposing the profound relevance of justice principles in understanding the link between spatial form and social processes (Swyngedouw and Merrifield 1996: 2).

Harvey (2004: 63) considers the geographical expansions and spatial reorganisations as a response to surpluses of capital and the need to absorb these and the impacts of deregulation and privatisation in order to facilitate capitalist accumulation, introducing the concept of “accumulation by dispossession” (2009: 326). Through this concept, Harvey (2008: 34) argues the process of displacement, which lies at the core of urbanisation under capitalism, asserting “the mirror image of capital absorption through urban re-development, giving rise to numerous conflicts over the capture of valuable land from low-income populations that may have lived there for many years”. Harvey’s argument is central to the vicious cycle previously mentioned; it asserts the

---

⁴ Encounter Athens consists of a group of young researchers exploring the city’s urban and spatial issues, creating a new narrative/discourse which supports the formulation of a just city. For more information, visit: https://encounterathens.wordpress.com/). [Last Accessed: 14/07/2018].
transformations imposed on urban space based on the economic requirements for development, through means of neoliberal governance. This process entails the deregulation of urban planning and result in privatisation of public space and property (Petropoulou et al. 2016: 55). These processes further result in neighbourhood gentrification, the systematic exploitation of ‘degraded’ neighbourhoods in need of ‘regeneration’ or of neighbourhoods in close proximity to spaces of cultural or commercial value, such as parks, archaeological sites or spaces near the seaside (Alexandri 2015: 36 cf. Davidson and Lees 2005). Therefore, neoliberal policies create optimum conditions for the accumulation of capital, whilst simultaneously displacing communities that can no longer afford to live in the newly constructed ‘regenerated’ neighbourhoods. As such, it creates an imbalance both in the urban and social structure of the city.

3.5.2 The Athens 2004 Olympic Games

Architect and active member of urban and environmental social movements Eleni Portaliou (2008), demonstrates the financial, social, spatial and environmental repercussions of the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens, leading to social resistance movements throughout the city. She reflects on the globalised neoliberal capitalism which, as in many other countries around the world, brought deep changes to the urban landscape but also in the general restructure of policies and planning in Greece ever since.

“Social, financial and political elites thought it would be easier to impose their neoliberal and antisocial policy on the majority of the population in the guise and glamour of a ‘great national idea’ and in the name of a better future for all.”

(Portaliou 2008: 2)

The megaproject—or as Portaliou characterises it, “great national idea”5—of Athens hosting the 2004 Olympic Games, was in fact the ‘tool’ through which to ‘modernise’ and ‘regenerate’ the country in the midst of the neoliberal urban governance policy fervour trending in the broader European Union during the 1990s. As such, new urban policies could be imposed for everyone’s ‘benefit’, placing Greece into the limelight with boundless prospects for economic development through tourism, and state-of-the-art facilities to be enjoyed after the completion of the event. Nevertheless, the spatial interventions resulted in the simultaneous downgrading and gentrification of inhabited districts, in many cases displacing inhabitants from their residences and further

---

5 It is important to note here that the term used by Portaliou is not coincidental; it echoes the expansionist vision of Metaxas’s dictatorship (1936-1941) known as the Megali Idea [Great Idea]—a mission to recreate a Greek empire under the nationalist endeavour of the Third Hellenic Civilisation (following those of classical antiquity and Byzantium). For more information on Metaxas, see Close 1992, 1993; Carabott 2003; Hamilakis 2007a: 169-204; Kallis 2007.
creating a distinct social differentiation amongst districts—often adjacent to one another—increasing social inequality whilst diminishing public space (ibid.: 4-5).

Another megaproject (within the Olympics’ megaproject) was the Unification of Athens Archaeological Sites Programme (henceforth UAAS) (see Figure 3.2 below). The programme operated as an S.A. company but was technically owned by the State (UAAS 2002a)—one of the many mixed private-public endeavours that gradually multiplied through the years. Its aim was to:

“...restore the historic continuity of the city; to create poles of attraction for its residents; to provide an overall upgraded environment that includes several functions, such as culture, where the harmonious co-existence of various city elements related to its cultural history and contemporary development highlight the historic physiognomy of Athens.”

(UAAS 2002b)

Figure 3.1 Still-frame from documentary Future Suspended (2014): encapsulating the issue with a telling visual.⁶

---

⁶ Photo used with permission by Antonis Vradis, but the documentary is also released under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND licence (for more details: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/deed.en_GB).
Whilst the historical background and ontological implications of the programme informs modern perceptions of national identity and space interpretation which could undoubtedly form the contents of another thesis, this research focuses on the repercussions of its materialisation in regards to the urban interventions within the city centre. Through its plan to display the city’s “historic continuity”, the programme initiated expropriations of land plots and housing, the regeneration of neighbourhoods found under its jurisdiction and the further demarcation of archaeological sites, among others (Karatzas 2011: 8). These interventions are reminiscent of the expropriation of an entire neighbourhood in the Thiseio area by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (1924-1931), in order to excavate and reveal the Athenian Agora (Sakka 2002; 2008; Hamilakis 2013). These works ultimately sought to ‘purify’ the city of its modern structures (cf. Caftanzoglou 2001; Yalouri 2001) through a number of city planning legislations which were introduced at the time (Karadimou-Yerolympou and Papamichos 1988). Similarly, the Unification Programme created a series of issues, most notably leading to the gentrification of areas such as Metaxourgeio, which was deemed as a degraded neighbourhood in need of regeneration (Karatzas 2011: 9), in order to become an acceptable addition to the network of the city’s historicity. The re-developments of Metaxourgeio resulted in forcing lower income families to move, as well as the rise in real estate prices and the change of the neighbourhood’s character (Alexandri 2018: 40). Ironically, the historical description of the Unification Programme ends with the following sentence: “The cultural, environmental, social and economic results of this programme will be of enormous importance” (Ministry of Culture 2002).
Figure 3.2 A poster indicating the planned works for the unification of archaeological sites in Athens (Ministry of Culture 2004).
3.5.3 Urban Movements and Residential Activism in Athens

Among other cities, both Graeber and Mason refer to the case of Athens in their writings. This comes as no surprise: over the last two decades, the Greek population has experienced the imposition of neoliberalising urbanisation and their effects both on the environment and urban landscape. Moreover, they were (and still are) faced with state corruption and instability, combined with the burden of austerity measures in addition to the bailout of a collapsing banking system. The frustration felt by the people is ‘embodied’ in their short and long-term reaction to the assassination of 15-year old student Alexandros Grigoropoulos by a police officer in 2008. Geographer Antonis Vradis and social anthropologist Dimitris Dalakoglou assert:

“What has been happening in Athens since December 2008, is an attempt by some of the participants in the December uprising to make their own claim to the city, and through this process to subvert the authority of the state over everyday life and to experience an unmediated and unobstructed fulfilment of their needs and desires.”

(Vradis and Dalakoglou 2011: 87)

Architect and activist Stavros Stavrides (2014: 546) concurs, claiming that emerging practices of urban commoning were catalysed both by the events that unravelled since December 2008 as well as the 2011 Syntagma Square Occupation. These events enabled citizens to act collectively and to reclaim the city as a “potentially liberating environment” reshaping thus crucial concerns and questions that characterise emancipatory politics (ibid.). These events and experiences have been a mobilising and motivational factor for citizens in need for alternative ways in dealing with a system which they find degrading and unjust, providing them with the necessary ‘tools’ to experiment with new and alternative forms of social organisation. Hadjimichalis (2014: 1-2) further asserts that despite the decrease of large-scale demonstrations and protests like in Syntagma, hundreds of bottom-up resistance and solidarity movements have risen throughout Greece protecting the commons and resisting privatisation amongst others.

Even before the events of 2008, the aftermath of the Olympics and the associated neoliberal practices which formed new spatialities of uneven developments, socio-spatial inequalities, urban space degradation and privatisation of public spaces, led to a number of localised initiatives in Athens (Arampatzi 2017b: 2157 cf. Arampatzi and Nicholls, 2012; Portaliou 2008). Amongst the numerous forms of urban and social movements that emerged, these also included local residential activist groups, resident committees and neighbourhood assemblies (Arampatzi and Nicholls 2012: 2600), dealing with issues ranging from urban planning, environmental concerns, and the re-appropriation of public spaces. To a great extent, these grassroots pursued different goals and formed their own solidarities, heavily reliant on their daily interaction in person (ibid.). A number
of these movements deteriorated in time, whilst others witnessed a fluctuation both in terms of their mobilisation but also in the number of active members involved. From my own personal observations and experiences, as well as through Arampatzi and Nicholls’s (2012) extensive study on anti-neoliberal social movements in Athens, some of the main features of these residential movements include: the common goals shared by members—oftentimes disregarding or putting aside conflicting political beliefs; the trust built and established amongst its members, which in many cases resemble a second family; the extensive networking processes between groups which arise from common objectives when dealing with similar local issues and grievances (ibid.: 2600); and the extensive knowledge gained through dealing with environmental issues or the appropriation of public space (amongst others), which inevitably lead activists to become more aware of the varying types of “regulatory frameworks, governance arrangements, methods to create campaigns, strategies for exerting pressure on political officials, and tactics to mitigate co-optation and repression” (ibid.: 2601). These are still prominent features in residential movements today which are dealing with the repercussions of the country’s social, political and economic crisis. As Hadjimichalis (2014: 2) observes, movements’ “prime field of struggle against neoliberal austerity is everyday life” particularly in their reclamation for social, spatial and environmental justice—“defending public space and the commons, both materially and symbolically”. Archaeological sites and monuments have a prominent position in the issues residential movements and initiatives are concerned with, bringing to the fore the need for alternative and inclusive heritage practices.

3.6 Concluding Thoughts

This chapter discussed the interrelated concepts of identity, temporality and space in the neoliberal age, through an exploration of the works which have stimulated my own perceptions, experiences, and by extension, this research. It critically addresses the re-evaluation of the concepts within a modern context, the restrictive confines of Western modernity, and the position of localities and archaeological sites within this framework.

Using the case of the Anafiotika as an introductory point of reference, this chapter demonstrates some of the issues faced by the communities which have participated in the present study. It identifies points of ‘similarity’ and of ‘difference’ relevant to the formation of identification, both of which function as unifying forces in the creation of a localised identity, a sense of belonging, as well as a motivating element to fight against injustices imposed by hegemonic structures. This sense of identification is further developed through the active engagement with space and multiple temporal modes which formulate an entanglement; this interlink is effectively experienced through the numerous social activities which temporalise the landscape, contribute to an affective relationship between people and the past, and facilitate interrelations which enable spaces to always be “in the process of being made” as Massey (2005: 9) argues.
This study utilises the Foucaultian concept of heterotopias to address the sacralisation of archaeological sites, particularly in the Greek context. Its malleable definition allows for an additional conceptualisation, one that addresses ‘other places’ created through practices of exclusion and resulting in “heterotopias of difference”. These concepts enable for a better understanding of the perception of these spaces on a more abstract and theoretical level, through my own personal observations of these and through my discussions with residential participants.

Archaeology and neoliberalism, much like archaeology and nationalism discussed in the previous chapter, have formed a dangerous relationship with serious consequences for communities, archaeological heritage, archaeologists, and the discipline. Crypto-colonialist endeavours as expressed by Herzfeld, mirror imperialistic modes of action through neoliberal policies and impositions, resulting in a number of issues; these vary from the commodification and commercialisation of heritage, to excessive urban and social reconfigurations and gentrification of neighbourhoods. Political ethics and praxis are necessary, in order to proactively protect both heritage and communities from vast social, political and economic injustices. Additionally, sensorial archaeology can further support this cause as it enables for the concurrent cultural, social, environmental, spatial, temporal and material awareness, which has been bound in structural and hegemonic compartments, hindering the full breadth and potential of our experience with archaeological heritage.

Within the context of the crisis, residential movements have utilised various forms of resistance to deal with the issues their localities are faced with. These grassroots mobilisations not only express the need to protect public spaces from privatisation, but also the necessity to be able to participate in the re-creation of the city. Archaeological sites have a prominent position in these reclamations, signifying the importance of these spaces as living, multi-temporal, multi-sensorial spaces to be actively used and re-appropriated beyond disciplinary, colonialist, and capitalist restrictions.
Chapter 4  A Historical Background

what sorrow it would have been – my God –

what sorrow
if my heart was not consoled
by the hope of marble
and the prospect of a bright sunray
which shall give new life
to the splendid ruins

exactly like
a red flower
amid green leaves  

Nikos Engonopoulos—famous poet, artist, and member of Dimitris Pikionis’s architectural team (Vourtsis n.d.), provides a sensorial depiction of the city’s “ashen atmosphere” along with the sense of hope he finds in the vivacity of marble and the new life it acquires through the sun—source of energy and life. His poem struck me as soon as I read it. It brings to mind the stagnation experienced by so many archaeological sites, fated to be frozen in time; he evokes a feeling of familiarity for Athenians through his subtle integration of the “splendid ruins” into the fabric of the urban environment, reminiscent of resilient flowers which make their way through cracked pavements and cement-jungles. When selecting the particular poem, I was unaware of Engonopoulos’s collaboration with Pikionis—the architect of the intricate pathways and interventions on Philopappou Hill.

This chapter provides a historical background of the two archaeological parks of interest. It presents selective historical information from both spaces as a guide to the themes and elements investigated in this research. It primarily utilises state-coordinated representations of the sites, such as archaeological records from excavations, articles, guides/brochures, official websites, and archives. Beyond providing a necessary historical background, this chapter further functions as a platform for the juxtaposition between state narratives and extra-official heritage discourses presented in the upcoming chapters (6-8)—the latter in many ways resembling the resilient flowers in Engonopoulos’ poem. It also introduces the neighbouring areas surrounding the archaeological parks as well as the spaces themselves, presenting their socio-cultural, political and economic

7Segment from Nikos Engonopoulos, “Tram and Acropolis”, Μὴν ομιλεῖτε εἰς στόν οδηγόν [Do not distract the driver], Translated by Yannis Goumas (1985 [1938]).
features through the years. Last, it provides a short history of the clashes and conflict that have materialised between local communities and state services.

4.1 Philopappou Hill

Most Athenians are familiar with Dionysiou Areopagitou Street, the pedestrian walkway which leads to the main entrance of Philopappou Hill. Walking up from the Acropolis Metro Station, a swift turn to the left leads visitors to the footsteps of the Acropolis Museum, hovering over the historical Weiler building. The walkway seems to be busy at all times of the year, night or day; whether through the nostalgic laterna\(^8\) playing in the background and transporting bystanders to a black and white film, or the French freestyling dancers who have attracted a crowd under the watchful eye of Ioannis Makrygiannis\(^9\)— forever immortalised on the walkway’s conjunction with Vyronos Street. A mini train with goggling tourists and camera lenses rides through the crowds, followed by a trail of disgruntled mumblings in Greek (see Figure 4.1 below).

Although it is always an interesting experience to walk on Dionysiou Areopagitou Street, my overstimulated senses compelled me to follow alternative routes, away from tourist attractions and noise overkill. Despite the festive colourfulness combined with the subtle mournful melody of the laterna, the parallel road of Hatzihristou Street became my most frequent route of choice when visiting the hill. The plethora of architectural movements represented in the buildings—especially the neoclassical and modernist styles—along with the souvenir shops displaying countless impeccable replicas of popular artefacts, are just a few of the ‘sights’ one can come across along the way. Most streets and businesses borrow some of the Acropolis’ prestige, composing a multitemporal crescendo leading up to the top of the road, accompanied by the olive-laden pavement of Rovertou Galli Street. Any observer would be able to notice the mixed status in the neighbourhood; from extremely affluent neoclassical homes and high-status restaurants overlooking the Acropolis, to more modest apartment buildings and businesses (usually without a view of the Sacred Rock). At the top of the moderate uphill, an open carpark with an innumerable amount of tourist coaches, taxis and cars unapologetically riding whatever is left of the pavement, encircling the fine-dining restaurant Dionysus. A couple hundred metres ahead, Rovertou Galli Street merges with the Dionysiou Areopagitou walkway; here, visitors stand at a visual meeting point of Philopappou Hill to the left, and the Acropolis to the right.

---

\(^8\) A manually operated barrel organ/piano, often in the form of a jukebox.

\(^9\) Prominent figure in the Greek War of Independence.
Figure 4.1 Top left: Nostalgia in a box: a laterna providing a musical prelude to the Dionysiou Areopagitou walkway for visitors (2012). Top right: The walkway in full visitor bloom (2012). Bottom: All aboard the tourist train: visitors enjoy a ride through the jam-packed walkway, the Acropolis hovering nearby (2012).
Philopappou Hill is located at the centre of the neighbourhoods of Makrygianni, Koukaki, Petralona, and Thiseio. It is one of the three hills comprising the Western Hills—their collective name being a reference to their location in relation and proximity to the Athenian Acropolis. The three hills—Philopappou Hill (also known as the Hill of the Muses), the Hill of the Nymphs, and the Pnyx (Figure 4.2)—are listed as a unified archaeological site, covering a total area of 700 acres. Archaeological works on the collective site of the Western Hills are directed by the Athens Ephorate of Antiquities, formerly the First Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities of Athens.\textsuperscript{10} It must be noted that today, people commonly refer to the grouping of the hills as Philopappou, despite being a compound of three hills. The overall space includes a vast number of archaeological traces ranging from early settlements, houses and workshops, to shrines, public buildings, roads and aqueducts, as well as the ancient demes of Melite, Koile (Figure 4.3) and Kollytos (Vogiatzoglou and Kavoura 2002a).

The neighbouring district on the southern borders of the hill is named Philopappou and forms the extension of the residential district of Koukaki. Scattered traces dating to the prehistoric times throughout the Koukaki, Philopappou and the adjacent, lesser known Gargaretta district, were unearthed during the residential expansion of the area in the early and mid-twentieth century (Vougiouka and Megaridis 2006: 15-20). Historical artifacts and structures uncovered reveal that despite the majority of the region being excluded from the city walls, there was human activity in the area. Lack of sufficient evidence however does not allow for a holistic indication of daily life during this period (ibid.). In the following centuries and up until the declaration of Athens as the capital of the newly formed nation-state in 1834, the area was predominately used as farmland for cultivation and livestock grazing (ibid. 18). The residential development of the region in the early twentieth century enabled the districts’ integration into the city’s urban planning scheme, leading to their comprehensive configuration by uses of land (ibid. 20). The neighbourhoods were the setting of important and often brutal events which transpired during the First and Second World Wars. They underwent complete urban and social degradation, including the execution of residents due to their involvement in resistance movements, as well as the use of Philopappou Hill by the Germans during WWII to set antiaircraft artilleries (ibid. 21-36).

\textsuperscript{10} The merging and change in the organisation of the Ephorates were one of the many regulations imposed by the memoranda to alleviate the country’s debt. According to the Ministerial Decision (ΥΠΠΟΑ/ΓΔΔΥ/ΑΟΕΠΠΥ/275923/40952/379) however, it was “the need to ensure that the Ministry of Culture and Sports functions smoothly and efficiently and that its affairs are forwarded expeditiously.” (Paragraph 2 of the Government Gazzette [Εφημερίδα Της Κυβερνήσεως] no. 2891 on October 29, 2014).
Figure 4.2 Map of the Western Hills within surrounding neighbourhoods. The Acropolis and important locations discussed are also indicated (Google Earth, 2018).
Figure 4.3 The ancient Deme of Koile (a and c). Koile road (b), the main avenue running through the deme. A view of the Philopappou Monument from the Hill of the Nymphs (d).
Figure 4.4 Visitors enjoy the sun at the hill of the Pnyx—the Philopappou monument is visible in the background (a). The view of the National Observatory from the Pnyx (b). The Orator’s Bema (c and d). Visitors enjoy the sunset at the Pnyx (e). The Sanctuary of Zeus Hypsistos (f). Fencing erected by the Archaeological Service separating Loumbardiaris Café and the Pnyx; Pikionis’s characteristic interventions visible on the floor and structure to the left (g). Traces of the ancient wall (Dipylon above the Gates) still standing (h).
Figure 4.5 Three dimensional satellite view of the Western Hills as seen from the Acropolis (Google Earth, 2017).
According to the official brochure of the hills produced and published for the Athens 2004 Olympics—a complimentary guide to the UAAS Programme and part of a series on the archaeological promenades around the Acropolis—the three hills "are a rocky formation to the west of the Acropolis, as if placed there by a divine hand to protect the sacred hill [the Acropolis] from the exposed sea-side and the valley of the ancient olive grove” (Lazaridou and Vogiatzoglou-Dakoura 2004: 1, my emphasis). Beyond the poetic account provided by the directors of the archaeological works at the Western Hills, the Hill of the Muses was named after Mousaios, a mythical singer, seer and priest who is said to have been buried on the hill in pre-Homeric times (Kleiner 1982:12).

Pausanias provides the first known description of the hill in his travels: “The Mouseion is a small hill, opposite the Acropolis, inside the ancient ring-wall, where they say Mousaios used to sing and died and was buried; later a memorial was erected there for a Syrian” (Pausanias I.25.6. in Frazer 1913: 326-328). Its modern name is a reference to the most prominent monument on the hill, the Philopappou Monument (Figure 4.6). The monument was built during 114-116 AD by the Athenians in honour of a major benefactor of the city, an exiled prince of Commagene, C. Julius Antiochus Philopappou, who settled in Athens, became a citizen and assumed various civic and religious offices (Travlos 1971: 462). According to Kleiner (1982: 98), the uniqueness of the monument lies in that it is “not Athenian, Roman or Commagenian; it is Philopappou’s Monument.”

Amongst the numerous Western travellers that visited Athens during the nineteenth century were Lord Byron and his traveling companion, John Hobhouse. Upon visiting the Philopappou Monument, Hobhouse noted that it was “covered, not to say defaced, with names of travellers. The name of an artist, Romaldi I think, who travelled with Mr. Dodwell, is, with unpardonable vanity, written up in half a dozen places” (in Eliot 1968: 142, see Figure 4.9). Most famously, two distinct “Western travellers” in the late twentieth century (1989)—musicians Van Morrison and Bob Dylan—met in the shadow of the Philopappou Monument and performed a four-song acoustic set for the BBC (2011) documentary Arena: One Irish Rover- Van Morrison in Performances (Figure 4.10).
Figure 4.6 Triptych: The Philopappou Monument in 2015.
Figures 4.7 (Top) and 4.8 (Bottom): Western travellers enjoying the view of the Acropolis from the Hill, much like tourists do today. Early nineteenth century vs. early twenty-first century. Top photo by: Gary Edwards [ca.1865], The Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles (92.R.84), bottom photo by author (2012).
Figure 4.9 The “Romaldi Effect”: Travellers leave their mark in time through the use of graffiti on the rear side of the Philopappou Monument, still visible today (2012).

Figure 4.10 Modern Western travellers Van Morrison and Bob Dylan rock up Philopappou Hill in 1989 (Photo Credit: alldylan.com).
4.1.1 Archaeological Excavations and Architectural Interventions on the Western Hills

Beyond the sketches and diary entries produced by Western travellers particularly in the nineteenth century, a number of excavations were materialised on the hills, gradually revealing their historical uses. The site of the Pnyx was first identified as an ancient assembly by antiquarian Richard Chandler in 1765 (Kourouniotes and Thompson 1932: 90 cf. Chandler 1817). Interestingly, both modern descriptions of the Pnyx by the Ministry of Culture and the Archaeological Society of Athens (hereafter ASA), fail to mention Chandler’s first identification of the space, limiting their information to the final confirmation of the site as the location of the classical assembly by the ASA in 1910. The ASA asserts that the defining identification of the site was largely dependent on Kyriakos Pittakis—the first native archaeologist of Greece (Hamilakis 2007a: 102)—and his discovery of a fifth century inscription in 1839 (Malouchou n.d.a).

The first excavation of the archaeological site of the Western Hills was conducted by George of Aberdeen in 1803—also on the Pnyx—bringing to light the sanctuary of Zeus Hypsistos (Kourouniotes and Thompson, 1932: 193-200). His excavations were continued in a more systematic manner by Ernst Curtius in 1862, while in the 1890’s a complex water-system was uncovered on the eastern side of the Pnyx by W. Dörpfeld (Lazaridou and Vogiatzoglou-Dakoura 2004: 6-7). Large scale excavations were held at the site of the Pnyx encompassing several stratigraphic levels between 1910 and 1939. These were performed by the Greek Archaeological Service as well as the American School of Classical Studies, primarily under the direction of H.A. Thompson, Kourouniotes and R. L. Scranton (ibid.; Vogiatzoglou and Kavoura 2002b).

The northwest segments of the hills—specifically, Philopappou Hill—were excavated initially in 1860/1 by the ASA, under the direction of Petros Pervanoglou (Malouchou n.d.c). Amongst others, his work confirmed the connection of the hills with Piraeus, the extensive habitation and municipalities that existed in the region, as well as the large number of rock-cut tombs which reached the summits of the Pnyx and the Hill of the Nymphs (Pervanoglou 1862: 84-85). The 1898 excavations were carried out specifically in the area of the monument and the following year consisted of work to conserve it, under the supervision of Andreas Skias (Travlos 1971: 462; Malouchou n.d.c). Travlos (ibid.) further asserts that in 1940, he and H.A. Thompson undertook a small exploratory excavation of the Philopappou Monument whilst studying and drawing it, which as the ASA claims (Malouchou n.d.c), was abandoned by the research community for half a century, despite the ASA’s efforts to reactivate works on site. The present form of the monument dates back to the restoration project undertaken by architect K. Balanos in 1904 (Lazaridou and Vogiatzoglou-Dakoura 2004: 39).

A significant milestone in the more recent history of the Hills, are the architectural interventions by nationally acclaimed architect Dimitris Pikionis (1954-1958). The interventions include promenade pathways emphasising the ancient ones that existed in antiquity, ‘viewing terraces’ and
rest areas, the restoration of the Byzantine church at the foot of the Hill dedicated to Saint Dimitrios Loumbardiaris, the creation of the adjacent Loumbardiaris Café, and the connection of the hill to the Acropolis.\(^\text{11}\)

In 1963, Prime Minister Konstantinos Karamanlis authorised the construction of a theatre on the western part of the hill to accommodate the “Greek Dances-Dora Stratou” society (Dora Stratou Greek Dances Theatre 2010). The society, under the guidance of Dora Stratou and her extensive folkloric research on dances, songs and costumes, established themselves as a national dancing ensemble, performing at the newly erected “Dora Stratou Theatre” as well as abroad (ibid.). Today, the theatre has been dubbed as “the living museum of Greek dance” (ibid.).

The most recent, systematic works performed by the state on the hills were under the auspices of the UAAS Programme (1997-2003) which—in the case of the Western Hills—aimed at their collective promotion as an “archaeological park” and to accentuate their archaeological, historical and environmental character (Vogiatzoglou and Kavoura n.d.). Table 1 below provides an overview of Ministerial Decisions, listings of historical/architectural landmarks and declarations concerning the Western Hills and by extension, Philopappou Hill. These decisions not only demonstrate the historical changes of the space throughout the years, but are also integral to the clashes existing between residential movements and state services.

\(^{11}\) It is worth noting that in Greek, the Loumbardiaris Café was constructed by Pikionis as a ‘rest area’ or anapaftirio (αναπαυτήριο). Andreas, a participant in this research which we will meet later on in this thesis, highlights the importance of the word anapaftirio, asserting the architect’s intention of the space to be utilised as a resting area, and not for other purposes.
Table 1 Declarations and Listings of Archaeological Sites/Historical Monuments (Western Hills).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LISTING/DECLARATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Western Hills declared Archaeological Site¹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>The Greek National Tourism Association (EOT) constructs fine-dining restaurant <em>Dionysus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Hill of the Nymphs listed as historical, environmental and architectural site¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Roads surrounding Acropolis declared Archaeological Sites¹⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Pikionis’s works on Western Hills listed as historical monument and work of art (pavements, flora, Café)¹⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-2004</td>
<td>Works and Promotion of Western Hills through UAAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Western Hills declared <em>Organised</em> Archaeological Site¹⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Greek Council of State reverses 2008 decision, allowing access to the hill at all hours of the day/night¹⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


¹⁷ Source: Council of State Decision number A2034/2015, accessible online at: http://www.adjustice.gr/webcenter/faces/wcnav_externalId/search-caselaws?bitId=10645825&_afrLoop=66269330668381567#%40%40%3F_afrLoop%3D66269330668381567%26bitId%3D10645825%26_adf.ctrl-state%3D5rdo080dd_65. [Last Accessed: 30/10/2018].
4.1.2 An Official View of Philopappou

In search of the extra-official heritage discourses associated with the spaces of interest, I believed it best to make use of the official narratives of the archaeological sites which are most easily accessible by the public. As such, I would be able to determine common points of reference and/or contrasting ‘top’ and ‘bottom’ perspectives. My first stop was the official description of the hills on the Ministry of Culture’s webpage, asserting that:

“the area of the three hills has a dual character, as it is an Archaeological and Historical space with great ancient remnants, but is also covered to a great extent by greenery and offers itself for casual walks and recreation.”

(Vogiatzoglou and Kavoura 2002a)

At first glance, this description seems to be in line with both official and extra-official uses of the archaeological park, determining its status as a space of archaeological significance but also as one for recreation and leisure. However—as I discovered in due time and as will be discussed in detail in Chapter 7—the Greek Archaeological Service and the residents from the neighbourhoods surrounding the hills have in fact a completely different opinion regarding what constitutes an archaeological site open to the public for recreational use. It is important to note here nonetheless, that the duality of the hills is still an important part of state-coordinated heritage practices, however with numerous conditions and stipulations involving the spaces recreational element.

Beyond the park’s status, my online research through official portals lead me to discover that there is a particular emphasis on the significance of the Pnyx. This focus is attributed to the hill due to its function as the place where the Athenian democratic assembly gathered to discuss political and civic matters between the late sixth-fourth centuries BC (Vogiatzoglou and Kavoura 2002b). After all, this was where political orators such as Demosthenes and Pericles, along with free (male) citizens, took important decisions that concerned major historical events (ibid.). The earlier and later phases of the spaces are limited in information, briefly mentioning their use during the Hellenistic, Roman and Ottoman Occupation periods.

The emphasis on the Classical period is also found in one of the earliest public reports associated with the site, published through the Archaeological Newspaper (Arhaiologiki Efimeris) the official scholarly journal of the Archaeological Society at Athens. The director of the excavations conducted in 1860/1, Pervanoglou (1862: 84) describes the hills as “humbler” compared to the Acropolis, suggesting nonetheless that they were ideal for habitation by ancient communities which had chosen the location wisely in accordance to climactic conditions. Moreover, he states that the existence of over one hundred rock-cut burials dating to “later periods…and the Byzantine times” on the northwest slopes of the hills—as well as their proximity to the classical monument—“polluted” the “sacred environment” of the Acropolis (ibid.: 85), as they were buried “within city
walls”. The latter statement is vaguely reminiscent of the concurrent treatment received by the Anafiotika settlement, which, like the Western Hills, lie in close proximity to the nation’s principal symbolic capital.

“Socrates’s Prison”, three rock-cut chambers on one of the hillocks located on Philopappou Hill (Figures 4.11 and 4.12) has been said to be the location where the famous philosopher was imprisoned before his death by poison; its association to Socrates was perhaps a continuation of folk tradition maintained by traveller’s texts and maps during the nineteenth century (Lazaridou and Vogiatzoglou-Dakoura 2004: 11). Despite its unknown use, archaeologists suggest that it could have also functioned as ancient baths in antiquity, whereas during the Second World War, it operated as a space for safe-keeping antiquities from the Acropolis and National Archaeological Museums (ibid.; Vougiouka and Megarids 2006: 43). Kimon’s Tomb is another prominent monument located on the hills (see Figure 4.13). The tomb is most likely attributed to Olympian winner Kimon the Elder (524 BC), whose son Miltiades famously fought in the Battle of Marathon, and is identified as such in the writings of Herodotus, Pausanias, Plutarch and Marcelinius (Lazaridou and Vogiatzoglou-Dakoura 2004: 4, 14-15). Furthermore, in 1842, the National Observatory of Athens was completed on the summit of the Hill of the Nymphs—a neoclassical structure which opened to the public four years later, funded by a Greek-Austrian Baron from Vienna named George Sina (National Hellenic Research Foundation n.d.). The selection of the particular location was due to its association of the site as the place where the astronomer Meton of Athens made his own observations in the fifth century BC (Lazaridou and Vogiatzoglou-Dakoura 2004: 31).

Figure 4.11 Prison, baths, or safe store for antiquities? The multiple uses of "Socrates's Prison" (2013).
Figure 4.12 Socrates’s prison through the eyes of a 7 year old boy participating in a summer school designed and conducted with fellow educators entitled “Argonauts” (7/7/2014).
Figure 4.13 Kimon's Tomb (2013).

An extensive study on the Hills written by archaeologist Olga Vogiatzoglou-Dakoura (hereafter Vogiatzoglou), former member of the (former) First Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities and director of the Hills during the works of the Unification of Archaeological Sites Programme (1998-2004). Her work encompasses detailed descriptions of the various uses of the site in time, giving equal balance to all historical periods and uses of the space. Vogiatzoglou includes meticulous references to the works of Western travellers and architects during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, elaborate official scholarly studies from prominent members of the archaeological service since the creation of the State, as well as historical accounts from ancient writers and travellers. One notable reference to the more recent history of the site includes the displacement of 1.5 million of refugees arriving to Athens in 1922 after the Greek-Turkish War forced them to leave, many of them finding shelter on the western part of the Hill. According to Vogiatzoglou, “the western region was occupied by a horrific shantytown...which was removed from the site, with the latest rehabilitation of refugees occurring in 1955” (2013: 207, my translation). “Luckily”, the space occupied by the refugees was “remediated with the removal of the refugee community... reinforced by the declaration of the Hills as a unified archaeological site [1963]” (ibid.: 208, my emphasis and translation). This act of remediation closely resembles the
cases of the Anafiotes and their act of ‘polluting’ the Sacred Rock, as well as the Thiseio neighbourhoods which were unjustly and forcefully removed from their homes in order to reveal the Athenian Agora. The common feature of all three communities and populations, unsurprisingly, is the fact that they represented the lower classes of society.

The most “insolent example of barbarity”—a case in point directly following the one above—was in 1938, during Ioannis Metaxas’ dictatorship (1936-1941). His plan was to create an open theatre upon the ancient municipality of Koile located on the southwest of the Hills. The works for the theatre remained unfinished due to the “intense protests by archaeologists and of the highly cultured members of society and the commencement of WWII, which fortunately left the catastrophic endeavour unfinished” (ibid.). What is interesting to see here, apart from the incredible significance of Metaxas’ plan as a distinctive example of his nationalist rule, is the conjunction between the two differing uses of the site. The former—an act of people in need—is equated with the catastrophic uses of the site through Metaxas’ nationalist interventions and appropriations of the space.18

Last, Vogiatzoglou’s study further offers her personal insight into the more recent works and life of the Hills:

“The potential archaeological value of the three Western Hills was promoted by the works of the Unification of the Archaeological Sites of Athens Programme (1997-2004). Their inclusion in the program was, arguably, the most important period in their historical course.”

(Vogiatzoglou 2013: 208, my translation and emphasis)

She asserts that the Archaeological Service created a space where visitors could finally learn about the history of the site in a more comprehensive manner, through the instalment of informational panels and stations, systematic educational programmes, ultimately reactivating and saving the site from its “depressing past of abandonment” (ibid.: 209). This success however, came at a price; Vogiatzoglou speaks of personal attacks, official complaints against herself and her co-workers as well as unresolved court battles.

18 For more information on Metaxas’s regime, his political convictions, uses of antiquity and his plan to establish his nationalist vision of the Third Hellenic Civilisation (which involved the expansionist endeavour of the Megali Idea [Great Idea] aimed at recreating a Greek empire) see: Close 1992; 1993; Carabott 2003; Hamilakis 2007a: 169-204; Kallis 2007.
4.1.3 A Concise History of Conflict

The Philopappou Movement was created on the day it held its first assembly on November 3, 2002, as a result of the initiative held by newly formed movements from the surrounding neighbourhoods.\(^{19}\) The meeting was a response to the enclosure of the hill by the Archaeological Service as part of the UAAS Programme. In their call to fellow neighbours and residents of the area, activists argued that the aim of the Service was to protect the financial interests associated with the site’s commercial exploitation and not from “dangerous visitors” as the latter had claimed (Athens Indymedia 2002). The assembly decided to bring down the fences that had been erected, resulting in three residents being arrested whilst they were on their way home. In 2003, residential activists continued to protest against the hills’ commercialisation, through protests, dissemination of leaflets, and further destruction of the fences erected around the park. They also held a three day thematic festival of events against the “city-prison”—a term alluding to the rapid changes in the urban environment of the capital, and the consequences of these to the everyday lives of residents. The festival’s aim was to discuss prospective forms of protest so as to protect free spaces from privatisations and urban planning on a general level, but also in light of the rapid developments involving the restrictions imposed on the hill. On the last day of the festival, local communities reported that they were confronted by riot police (MAT) as instructed by the Archaeological Service, to prevent them from holding a celebration on the southern part of the hill (Residents’ Intervention Blogspot 2003).

Following the fifth destruction of the fences around the hill by residents, the Ministry of Culture released a statement (in April 2004) clarifying that the purpose of the fencing was meant for the protection of the archaeological space, and not as a precursor to an entrance fee (Ministry of Culture and Sport 2004).\(^{20}\) Nevertheless, in 2007 additional clashes ensued due to the erection of fences surrounding the Pnyx Hill. Once again, members of the residents’ movement were arrested (Tzanavara and Morou 2007) while a few months later, the CAC officially declared the hill as an organised archaeological site. This decision was seen by residents as a re-surfacing of plans to enclose the space for its commercialisation and restriction of everyday use by local communities (Philopappou Residents’ Blogspot 2007a). Eight years later, the decision was overturned by the Council of State,\(^{21}\) after repeated efforts through legal means from members of the movement, thus granting the public access to the hills at all times.

---

\(^{19}\) These include the initiatives “Residents of Petralona-Thisio-Philopappou-Makrygianni Intervention”, the “Residents of Petralona Intervention”, and the “Philopappou-Koukaki Ecological Intervention”, amongst others.

\(^{20}\) See Appendix B for full press release.

Further contestations in late 2007 and 2008 involved the residents’ initiative to plant trees on the hill in an attempt to protect the flora and re-cultivate what was lost from the numerous fires which had taken place in 2003. Archaeologists were present on the day of the residents’ tree-planting venture, later proceeding in pressing charges against three individuals for disruption of backfilled spaces among the hill. The residents were acquitted in 2013 (ibid. 2015a). Two years later, the movement filed an extrajudicial statement against the Ministry of Culture, the General Directorate of Antiquities and Cultural Heritage, and the Athens Ephorate of Antiquities, in an effort to obstruct further damage to the hill’s environmental features (ibid. 2015b). The statement argued for the protection of the trees parallel to the church of St. Dimitrios Loumbardiaris, the great pine tree adjacent to it, and any potential interventions to the works of Dimitris Pikionis that do not correspond to the architect’s original plans.

An additional extrajudicial statement filed by residents deals with what they claim is the illegal operation of the fine-dining restaurant *Dionysus* located on the foothill of Philopappou Hill—surprisingly, a prime location for members of the government to welcome foreign dignitaries for dinners upon their arrival in Athens. The statement questions the legality of the establishment, the ownership of the land upon which the restaurant is built on, and its gradual extension upon the hill. This statement was supplementary to a cancellation request sent to the Court of Appeal in 2015, for which, at the time these lines are written, is still pending trial.

Presently, the residents’ movement continue to meet and hold assemblies throughout the years in order to discuss issues pertaining to the hills, to vote collectively on plans of action, and to coordinate legal procedures necessary to counteract potential decisions made by state services. The events described concisely in this section have been confirmed both by residents and archaeologists which were present, albeit from different perspectives.

4.2 Plato’s Academy

Approximately four kilometres northwest of Philopappou Hill lies Plato’s Academy, another open archaeological park with free access to visitors at all hours of the day. My very first visit in 2012 made me realise how extensive the park was—approximately 150 acres—but also its anarchic configuration within the neighbourhood. Driving toward the Academy through the Metaxourgeio district, it was easily discernible that the neighbourhoods in this part of Athens were composed primarily of working-class households. The worn-out signs indicating the location of the archaeological site were difficult to follow amongst the narrow streets and densely built neighbourhoods. The plethora of derelict, abandoned buildings and closed businesses revealed fragments of the neighbourhood’s history, its socioeconomic status, as well as the effects of the crisis. Turning off my GPS system, I decided to drive along Platonos Street, trusting that the name would lead me to what I was looking for. After all, the metro only came as far as the Metaxourgeio,
Sepolia and Elaionas neighbourhoods, in close proximity to and surrounding the areas of Plato’s Academy and Kolonos, but not close enough for visitors to have better access. The park was scheduled to be added to the works of the UAAS Programme in 1997 (Goumopoulou et al. 2009: 3; Petras 2013) but the failure of its inclusion has been associated—amongst others—with the lack of efficient public transportation to the area from the city centre and beyond.

**Figure 4.14** Map of the archaeological grove of Plato’s Academy within surrounding neighbourhoods. Important locations discussed are also indicated (Google Earth, 2018).

---

Figure 4.15 A few images from the surrounding areas encircling the archaeological park. Some houses have incorporated busts of Plato into their entrances (top left), a tribute to the philosopher. The church of St. Nicholas (bottom right) is a landmark in the neighbourhood. A worn-out sign (bottom left) welcomes visitors to the park.
Walking down Tripoleos Street, the patrons of the café *Platon* are engaged in all sorts of activities: backgammon, political and sports discussions, card games and small talk with passersby. Turning right on to Monastiriou Street, I encounter a temporary makeshift sitting area by a group of Romani families, their children playing games in the park across. The frequency of graffiti condemning racism along with run-down posters for anti-fascist festivals reveals clues as to one of the most striking differences between this neighbourhood and of those around Philopappou Hill; the demographic make-up of Plato’s Academy had led to increased racist attacks in the area due to its multi-ethnic and migrant build-up.

On my way to visit the Cooperative Café, one of the first things I noticed was the evident distinction amongst the houses and apartment buildings located on the boundaries of the park; some were run-down and in dire need of renovation, whereas others were newly structured and in excellent condition. Oddly, a seemingly provisional storage for antiquities was located adjacent to one of the newer apartment buildings on the cross between Monastiriou and Eukleidou Streets (Figure 4.16). I later found out this was due to the limited space in the nearby—highly secured and limited visually—storage on Drakontos Street belonging to the Athens Ephorate of Antiquities (Figure 4.17).

---

23 The Cooperative Café opened in 2010 through the collaborative effort of active citizens who wanted to promote a social, solidarity economy, enabling fair trade and respect towards the environment. The Café hosts a number of events varying from film viewings, group discussions, experiential workshops, culinary classes and others (for more information, see their Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/pg/Kafeneio_Ak.Platona/about/?ref=page_internal). [Last Accessed: 15/10/2018].
Figure 4.16 Provisional storage for antiquities between Monastiriou and Eukleidou Streets (2014).

Figure 4.17 Storage for antiquities, Drakontos Street (2014).
The district of Plato’s Academy borders the areas of Sepolia to the north, Votanikos to the south, Metaxourgeio to the southeast, and Kolonos to the east. The west-northwestern part of the neighborhood is adjacent to a region characterised as an Industrial Park (ΒΙΟΠΑ), separating Plato’s Academy from the districts of Elaionas and Peristeri. The neighbourhood is surrounded by the Athinon and Kifissou Avenues which lead to the National Motorway, as well as the Intercity Coach Station (ΚΤΕΛ). Today, the archaeological works at the Academy are conducted and supervised by the Athens Ephorate of Antiquities, formerly the Third Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities of Athens.

The neighbourhood of Plato’s Academy was officially incorporated into the city’s urban plan on July 17, 1893, after a series of consecutive expansions in the general region (Hatziotis 2005: 37-38). The area was primarily used for cultivation during the mid-twentieth century, along with the establishment of textile, tobacco and leather tanning factories (Goumopoulou et al. 2009: 6). The increasing numbers of factories and industrial activity during the early 1900s—including most prominently in the neighbouring Metaxourgeio district—led to the growing population residing in the particular neighbourhoods (ibid.). It was in fact the construction of the Peiraeus-Patras railway in 1887 which essentially separated and formed the two districts, leading the western part of the tracks—the neighbourhood later to be officially known as Plato’s Academy (Akadimia Platonos)—to become autonomous and gradually formulate its own “personality” (ibid: 52). However, the area was plagued by the “Minotaur”24—the swamp-like sewage disposal which released unpleasant odours and resulted in various diseases due to the lack of proper sanitation (ibid: 52, 73). Along with the adjacent cemetery, the Minotaur contributed to the further degradation of the neighbourhood as well as a series of additional toponyms attributed by surrounding districts (See Biris 2006 [1971]; Hatziotis 2005). Despite the colloquial references to the area, the ancient name of the neighbourhood has most likely been maintained throughout the centuries, as it can also be found in documents dating to the final years of the Ottoman occupation (albeit, as Kathimia as opposed to Akadimia) (Biris 2006: 16).

---

24 The name was most likely attributed to the swamp as an allusion to myth of the Minotaur and the human sacrifices offered by Athenians in order to alleviate the plague which had been inflicted upon Athens as compensation for the death of the Cretan prince, Androgeos—king Minos’s son (Hard 2004: 336-340). The labyrinth-like sewage system of Plato’s Academy, along with the diseases it brought to the local population resemble the mythological home of Minotaur and the plague afflicting the city in the myth.
4.2.1 The Academy through Ancient, Modern, and Official Narratives

As its name suggests, the archaeological park was home to Plato’s school of philosophy in the late classical period and is considered today to be the first university established. A number of ancient sources make references to the broader region, the school, as well as the origins of the name “Academy”. Plutarch (Kimon 13) attributes the name Academy (or Akadimia [Ακαδημία]) to the mythical hero Academos who helped save Helen when she was kidnapped by Theseus. He further asserts that Kimon, the fifth century BC Athenian general and statesman,\textsuperscript{25} transformed the Academy “from a parched and barren wilderness into a well-watered grove, which he provided with shady paths to walk in and clear tracks for races” (ibid.). Pausanias (Attica xxx. 1-4) recounts the altars located in the Academy, honouring Prometheus, the Muses, Hermes, Athena, and Hercules. He further informs us that a monument was erected not far from the Academy dedicated to Plato, “to whom heaven foretold that he would be the prince of philosophers” (Plin. Xii. I. in Kastromenos 1884: 94).

British topographer, diplomat and antiquarian W.M. Leake (1821) follows the ancient sources through the Dipylon\textsuperscript{26}—the Athenian double-gated wall which separated the inner city from the outskirts and led to the Academy. He asserts that the Academy was six or eight stades from the Dipylon, near Ippios Kolonos (Ιππιος Κολωνός) which according to Thucydides (1. 8. C. 67 in Leake 1821: 78) was dedicated to Poseidon and was located near the banks of the Kifissos River. Tracing the path from the Dipylon through the writings of Plutarch, Leake (1821: 81-82) describes the way to the Academy:

“...the road passes through the olive woods, and in the midst of them traverses the Cephissus [sic], running in two branches. The heights very clearly mark the site of the demus of Colonus [sic]... A little short of the nearer height, on the left hand of the road, there are some open fields on the edge of the olive-groves, still bearing the name of Akadhimia, or Akadhimi [sic]. Here, therefore, we have the exact situation of the Academy, as described by ancient authors, with its name still preserved.”

The abundance of ancient and modern sources on the location, operation and nature of the Academy reveals the fascination attributed to the space.\textsuperscript{27} Its historical significance as a cultural and intellectual centre are prevalent, not only in regards to Plato’s school of thought, but also the extensive history before and after the philosophy school’s operation.

\textsuperscript{25} Grandson of Kimon the Elder whose tomb was located on Philopappou Hill.

\textsuperscript{26} The Dipylon Gate was constructed in 478 BC and consisted a part of the Themistoclean fortification walls built after the conclusion of the Persian Wars.

\textsuperscript{27} See also Kastromenos (1884: 91-95).
The official description provided by the Ministry of Culture and written by the then Ephorate, briefly discusses the traces of early settlements in the area from the prehistoric times to the archaic period. It focuses on the school of philosophy established by Plato in 388 BC and its eventual destruction by Sulla in 86 BC. Moreover, it states that the school operated for approximately a thousand years, reaching its peak with the Neoplatonist philosophers until its closure in 529 AD by order of Justinian, “defining thus the end of the ancient world” (Iliopoulos 2012). The three most significant visible monuments of the Academy are defined by the official description as the “Sacred House”, the Gymnasium, and the rectangular Peristyle, which will be discussed in further detail in the next section. The historical background ends with the excavations conducted between 1955 and 1963 by Stavropoulos.

In addition, a brochure created in 2015 by the Athens Ephorate of Antiquities presents the director of the Ephorate’s affirmation:

“The centuries passed, and the leaves of the earth covered the book of visible history, until the moment archaeologists brought it back to the light and the legendary Academy was revived. The state took care of the antiquities with respect and it continues to do so more vigorously, with a vision”.

(Eleni Banou in Panagiotopoulos and Hatziefthimiou 2015, my translation and emphasis)

The link between the past and the present, the darkness evoked by the leaves which covered the site’s history, and the light provided by the archaeological team is a consistent theme in state archaeological narratives. Archaeologists are seen as the stewards of antiquity/heritage, the light-bearers, the protectors of the archaeological record, and the revivers of the past. Ultimately, Banou’s introductory prologue for the works of the Service at Plato’s Academy implies that the protection and care of the archaeological park has solely been provided by the state, failing to include the safeguarding, maintenance and attention provided to the space by the local community. The exclusion of the residents that have not only integrated the space into their daily lives but were also a part of the space before their homes were expropriated, is yet another omission of official narratives which discreetly takes full credit for the preservation of the space and dismisses extra-official appropriations and discourses.
Figure 4.18 Archaeological remnants and interventions by the Greek Archaeological Service. Some segments of the park are enclosed without any information panels to indicate what lies beyond the fencing (top left); The Sacred House of Academos after the works of the Archaeological Service (top right). Two visitors discuss amongst that scattered stones (middle). The Service’s interventions on the segment of Odos Kratylou (bottom left). All photos taken in 2017.
4.2.2 Excavating the Academy

“...[t]he entire intellectual world should indeed be immensely grateful to [the Prime Minister], Mr. Ioannis Metaxas, and his distinguished Minister [of Education] Mr. Konstantinos Georgakopoulos, who, with their bright minds and strong creative thought, undertook to lawfully restoring the Academy's rightful possessions, which, insofar as it was unjust, were removed in 529 BC with Emperor Justinian's famous decree. The future historian of the Academy will certainly be obliged to combine the two historical deeds.”

(Aristophron 1938: 5)

In a speech welcoming local and international scholars visiting the site of Plato’s Academy, Panagiotis Aristophron cordially acknowledges the Prime Minister of Greece and the Minister of Education for their contribution in drafting a law which would enable 550,000 square metres of land to be expropriated in the neighbourhood of Plato’s Academy (ibid.). Interestingly, he creates a transversal link in time between the Prime Minister’s “radiant act” (ibid.), the infamous closure of the Academy by Justinian, and the future researcher which will—most certainly—relate the two former historical deeds. The tour of the site was to commemorate the centennial anniversary since the founding of the Archaeological Society, consisting thus of a tribute within a tribute, on October 27th, 1938.

Aristophron, an architect and “Egyptiote admirer” of Plato, was the first to excavate the Academy in 1929 through his own initiative, direction, and expenses until 1940 (Iliopoulos 2012). The excavations were conducted under the auspices and supervision of the Academy of Athens, with the expertise of archaeologists K. Kourouniotis, A. Filadelfea, and I. Travlos (Travlos 1971: 42; Malouchou n.d.b; Panagiotopoulos and Hatziefthimiou: 14). Despite the “formidable practical and legal difficulties” (Wycherley 1962: 6),28 Aristophron discovered the Gymnasium dating to the first century A.D (Panagiotopoulos et al.: 14), a large rectangular structure with an internal peristyle, with additional rooms on the northern side and an internal area which functioned as a palaestra (see Figures 4.19 and 4.20).

28 Robinson, Stillwell, and Van Buren (1933: 491) further reveal the difficulties Aristophron confronted in his endeavour to perform exploratory trenches due to the existence of the modern city above ancient remains.
Figures 4.19 and 4.20 The Gymnasium (top) and a cistern (bottom) for athletes to bathe in (2014).
Archaeologists believe that the rooms located on the northern part of the structure could potentially be the location of the Academy’s library (Iliopoulos 2012). On the southwest of the Gymnasium, Aristophron’s excavations revealed a Geometric cemetery whilst in the northeast, the foundations of a colonnade were discovered and interpreted as the Peripatos (Robinson and Blegen 1934: 602). Aristophron further unearthed the foundations of a rectangular Peristyle structure (dating to the fourth or third centuries BC), which presently has been interpreted by archaeologists as the real palaestra of the Gymnasium (Iliopoulos 2012). Painted ceramic metopes dating to the sixth century BC indicate the existence of an earlier public structure in the location of the Peristyle (ibid.).

Aristophon’s work was disrupted for three years due to excessive rain and subsequent flooding of the nearby river Kifissos, which resulted in the submersion of the excavations he had conducted (Aristophron 1938: 3). Much like the neighbourhoods built on the remnants of the Athenian Agora discussed in the previous chapter, the densely populated district at Plato’s Academy was yet another significant obstacle he encountered during his work (ibid.: 4)—leading to Aristophron’s immense appreciation of the new law on expropriation being passed. As Robinson and Blegen noted at the time:

"Every effort is being made to hasten the passage of the law making the region of the Academy into an Archaeological Zone, where the houses covering the site may be bought and the whole area cleared, under the same conditions as those applied in the Agora district."

(Robinson and Blegen 1937: 140)

Yet again, and in a similar manner to the residents of the Agora area (Sakka 2008: 120), “The excavations in the Academy of Plato have been held up by the inhabitants of the neighbourhood” (Payne 1935: 153). This statement was also the only published reference by The Journal of Hellenic Studies in regards to the progression of the works conducted by the architect that year.

Aristophron’s dream of discovering the exact location of the Academy was never fulfilled (Panagiotopoulos et al.: 14), despite the certainty and confidence of national and international scholars at the time.29 His work was never concluded due to the commencement of the Second World War (and his death in 1945), and the results of his findings were only briefly publicised through annual archaeological reports.30

29 Most prominently, Payne (1933: 273) which at the time, asserted: “…it is thought that this cannot be anything but the Academy”.

30 See American Journal of Archaeology, 1933, Vol. 37 (pg. 491); 1934, Vol. 38 (p. 602); 1937, Vol. 41 (pp. 138-140); The Journal of Hellenic Studies, 1933, Vol. 53 (pp. 272-274); 1934, Vol. 54 (pp. 188-189); 1935, Vol. 55 (p. 153).
Further excavations of the Academy were continued by archaeologist F. Stavropoullos from 1955-1963, funded by the Archaeological Society (Malouchou n.d.b). His work gradually revealed the House of Academos, an apsidal tripartite building dating to the late third century BC, consisting of three consecutive spaces which Stavropoullos interpreted as a prodromos, a corridor, and a “cook house” (Stavropoullos 1956: 53-54; Panagiotopoulos et al.: 16). To the south and in close proximity, the archaeologist discovered a building constructed of sun-dried brick which he called the “Sacred House” (Travlos 1971: 42, see Figures 4.21 and 4.22). His identification was based on the assumption that the cult structure was built to honour the first founders and heroes of the area, particularly Academos (ibid.). The complex structure dates to the Geometric period and consists of several rooms connected by a corridor. There were traces of ceremonial fires present as inferred by the abundance of burnt pottery shards and bones, further strengthening Stavropoullos’s interpretation of the structure (Panagiotopoulos et al.: 16). In November 1961, excessive rainfall flooded the excavations of the Sacred House, creating severe damages to the ongoing works of the space (Stavropoullos 1961: 10). A protective canopy was applied over the structure during the same year, replaced in 2014 by the Archaeological Service, who further proceeded in backfilling the site for conservation (Panagiotopoulos et al.: 27).

Figure 4.21 The Sacred House of Academos in 2014, a few months before the Service commenced their works. Taken while on a guided tour of the park's modern history by local activist.
Figure 4.22 The inside of the Sacred House beyond the fencing and before archaeologists backfilled the structure (2014).
The archaeological park of Plato’s Academy was gradually defined and delineated through a series of legislations passed from 1957 onwards (See Table 2). These legislations indicate the increasing expansion of the space’s boundaries, the characterisation of the site as an “archaeological grove” and the inevitable expropriations imposed by the state in an effort to extend the space. Further extensions of the archaeological park were drafted in 2000, in an effort to include private residences/properties which were located on expropriated land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Listing/Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>25 acres adjacent to Plato’s Academy farmland declared archaeological site³²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Plato’s Academy declared archaeological site³³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Amendment to previous Ministerial decision, expanding archaeological site and prohibiting all forms of construction³⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>The Academy is declared an archaeological grove³⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Plato’s Academy becomes part of UAAS Programme³⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Extension of archaeological park’s boundaries, inclusion of expropriated private properties³⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Approval for re-demarcation of archaeological site’s limits³⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Declarations and Ministerial Decisions concerning archaeological park of Plato’s Academy.

³¹ “Farmland” is used here to denote the land purchased and expropriated by Aristophron to conduct his excavations in 1930-1939.
³⁴ Source: ibid. Ministerial Decision: YA 10782/17-6-1965 - ΦΕΚ 402/B/5-7-1965
³⁶ Source: Unification of Archaeological Sites Programme, webpage does not exist anymore but can be retrieved through Internet Archive at https://web.archive.org/web/20070901173526/http://www.astynet.gr:80/
4.2.3 An Introduction to the Clashes

In 2008, the Prefecture of Athens attempted to construct an administrative building within the residential area of Plato’s Academy, in close proximity to three schools. The residents’ immediate mobilisation to prevent the building quickly led to the formation of the neighbourhood’s Residential Committee. The Committee’s activism involved—amongst others—appeals to the Municipality of Athens in an effort to declare the land plot in question as a space for the potential construction of additional schools (Mertzelou 2009a: 10-11). Their fight to reclaim the space against the Prefecture ended officially in 2016, when a Presidential Decree was issued for the alteration of the town planning scheme and the characterisation of the land plot as a space for the construction of schools (Government Gazette 2016).

2008 was also the year when the increasing real estate interests and fast-track models of financial development lead private stakeholders to the Academy area, and more specifically on the industrial site of the historical Mouzakis textile complex located on the northern border of the archaeological park. Their intention to create a colossal shopping mall in close proximity to the park extending over an area of 55,000 m² was given the green light by the government through a series of ministerial decrees. State services saw to altering and tailoring existing Urban Design Plans accordingly, as well as expropriating and demolishing listed industrial structures through accelerated Ministerial Decisions so as to accommodate the investing entities. The plan was further incorporated into the Municipality’s business and development programme “Re-Launching Athens”, aiming to “revitilise the city economically, socially and aesthetically” by 2020 (Re-Launching Athens 2015: 3). Despite the consecutive regulatory modifications and programmes advancing the construction of the mall, the Residential Committee was once again successful in preventing further development in 2013 and 2014 through their appeals to the Council of State. They further had the support of leftist MPs who strongly objected to the plan, claiming that the state was exploiting the cultural and environmental character of the area through capitalist plans and policies. However, it was the leftist party SYRIZA which was voted into government in 2015 that proceeded in passing a Presidential Decree through the Ministry of Environment and Energy to alter the designated height of constructed buildings in the area so as to provide the plan the green light once again. The proposal was also approved by the Central Archaeological Council, leading to the decision of the Government Economic Policy Council to proceed with the construction of the private, multinational investors.

Ironically, the mall is proposed to be named Academy Gardens.

Another important yet conflicting issue that the Committee has fought for in the last ten years is the construction of the Museum of the City of Athens. The museum has inducted in urban design plans by the Municipality to be incorporated within the space of the archaeological park (Goumopoulou et al. 2009: 14). Nevertheless, despite welcoming the creation of the museum as the form of
development they are aligned with, the Committee has been divided in regards to the location chosen for its construction. The museum has yet to be constructed as of December 2018.

Beyond their appeals to the Council of State and the Municipality of Athens, their questions and official letters to parliament, as well as their constant efforts to propose new plans for the rejuvenation of the neighbourhood without the construction of a mall, the residents continue to mobilise against the commercialisation of the archaeological park. Their forms of activism involve the dissemination of leaflets, the publication of a trimonthly newspaper, active social media presence through a blog as well as on Facebook, festivals and concerts at the park and numerous protests outside Ministerial and government buildings. The mobilisation to protect the park has further stimulated social, political and economic solidarity in the neighbourhood. The Residents’ Committee “headquarters” called the Steki (free translation: Hangout) provides essential supplies to families and individuals in need; the self-managed Cooperative Café promotes an alternative social and economic solidarity offering a space for collaboration and dialogue to flourish; and Politeia functions as a cultural centre for residents and friends to participate in a variety of creative and educational activities. All three spaces are located on Monastiriou Street and are adjacent to one another, just a few metres opposite the park (see Figures 4.23-4.25).

Figure 4.23 The Residents’ Committee headquarters, the Steki (2017).
Figure 4.24 The Cooperative Café at Plato’s Academy (2017).

Figure 4.25 The neighbourhood’s cultural centre, Politeia (2017).
4.3 Demographic Profile of Case Studies

The demographic profile presented here is intended to provide an insight into the varying components that together comprise the social, political, educational and economic features directly or indirectly contributing to the multifaceted interactions between local communities and archaeological spaces. By exploring the demographic composition of different neighbourhoods, this thesis aims to discover the multiplicity of interactions with sites, their perception of these, and to what extent neighbourhood social and economic statuses affects these. The social, economic and educational status of a neighbourhood both directly and indirectly plays a catalytic role in the way local residents engage with archaeological sites. For instance, it can provide an insight to the correlation between districts with a higher-rate of unemployment/lower-income families and their ability to afford outings and other forms of entertainment that require payment, therefore leading to increased use of archaeological spaces for recreational purposes. On the other hand, sites that are located near higher-income households are potentially less likely used for daily activities as neighbouring residents can afford to spend money for entertainment elsewhere.

According to the Hellenic Statistical Authority’s (ELSTAT n.d.)39 General Population Census of 2011, there are great variabilities in terms of the number of inhabitants in each district, unemployment rate, educational levels and plurality/diversity of ethnicities/nationalities. It is important to note that these statistics reflect the living conditions and status of these areas a year before the initiation of the present thesis and, since the next General Population Census is scheduled to take place in the year 2021, they may not necessarily represent an entirely accurate reflection of the build-up of each neighbourhood at the time this thesis is completed. Methodologically therefore, these statistics are further supplemented through my interviews and personal observations and conclusions in order to compose a more accurate and informed resident profile in the sites of interest.

For the purposes of this research, I selected areas encircling the archaeological parks and are in close proximity to them. Another factor in the selection of the districts involved in this endeavour was to include neighbourhoods which have Residential Committees and Associations actively involved in the reclamation of the parks. For Philopappou, this includes the districts of Koukaki, Philopappou, Ano Petralona and Thiseio (Figure 4.26); for Plato’s Academy, these are the districts of Kolonos, Plato’s Academy and Sepolia amongst others (Figure 4.27). The total perimeter of the area studied for Philopappou is 6.24 km and 7.37 km for Plato’s Academy. It must be noted

39 The Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT) is the national statistical service of Greece and its main responsibility is to collect pertaining to the country’s population. The data collected by the agency deals with a variety of fields such as health and social security, employment rates and education, amongst others. The data is utilised both by the Greek State as well as European and international organisations, by businesses, the academic community, citizens and others interested in statistical data.
however, that a sufficient area bordering the northwest border of the park is consisted of industrial buildings and land plots. The parks account for a perimeter of 2.85 km and 2.14 km, respectively.

Figure 4.26 Philopappou Hill and surrounding neighbourhoods (Google Earth, 2018).
As of 2011, the neighbourhoods surrounding Philopappou Hill consist of a population of 33,436 residents, whereas Plato’s Academy has a population of 51,347; the latter is hence significantly more densely populated than the former. According to the ELSTAT findings, the residents living in the districts surrounding Plato’s Academy have a slightly higher rate of unemployment as opposed to those living near Philopappou. Approximately 61% of the population residing in Plato’s Academy is unemployed and economically inactive, whereas 59% of the population of the neighbourhoods in close proximity to Philopappou Hill is either unemployed or economically inactive. Overpopulation and unemployment are two interdependent factors and the harsh financial reality of Greece today renders their effect even more impactful on each resident and the communities as a whole.

Figure 4.27 Plato’s Academy and surrounding neighbourhoods (Google Earth, 2018).
In terms of the ethnic composition of the areas, the ELSTAT statistics show that there are approximately 87% Greeks residing in the areas surrounding Philopappou Hill, whereas the remaining 13% of the population is composed of other ethnicities. In the case of Plato’s Academy, 81% of the population are recorded as Greek ethnically, whereas 19% of residents are reported to be of other ethnic backgrounds. Although the change between the percentages appears to be minor, the significant difference between the population numbers in each area shows that there is a more multicultural population at Plato’s Academy. A research conducted by the National Technical University of Athens in 2013 found that:

“*The area is [...] characterised by morphological contrasts, which indicate latent social inequalities. Contrast-like the ‘old’ and ‘new’- with regard to new multi-story residential buildings ‘springing up’ between low old houses, and contrasts between different functions, operations and productive contrasts (‘luxury’ business buildings between the world of garages, low incomes and various minority ethnic groups).*”

(Petras 2013)

Regarding the educational level of Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy, the statistics indicate the following: 35.38% of the population living near Philopappou Hill has received tertiary education, including both undergraduate and postgraduate levels, whereas 21.19% of the population at Plato’s Academy has attended university. Despite both areas having approximately 10,000-11,000 University graduates each, the percentile for Plato’s Academy as indicated is lower, due to the overall size of the population in the particular district. In addition, 53.24% of Philopappou Hill residents have received either a primary or secondary education, as opposed to 63.5% of the residents at Plato’s Academy. In contrast to the percentages of university graduates from each district, the individual members representing primary and secondary educated residents differ significantly: the number of individuals attending solely primary and secondary education in the area of Plato’s Academy is almost double the population completing the equivalent academic school years in the districts surrounding Philopappou Hill (32,502 and 17,802 respectively).
Table 3 Case studies’ population statistics according to ELSTAT.

Numbers do not always give an accurate representation of what a neighbourhood might look like in reality. For anyone visiting these locations, they will discern a striking sociocultural and economic discrepancy between the two. According to Petras (2013) the first arrival of economic migrants from countries of the former USSR in the 1980s, as well as the second wave of immigrants from Asia in the early 2000s, combined with the Romani population in the area have created racial tensions in the neighbourhoods for several years. On the other hand, the middle and upper class socioeconomic status of the Philopappou neighbourhoods, along with the significantly higher pricing of real estate (Trivoli 2009), does not provide the optimum location for economic migrants to relocate in the particular area. As such, there is a substantial difference between the population configurations between the two case studies. This dichotomy indirectly informs the level of education in both areas, as well as the employment opportunities and economic activity of the residents. These elements were taken into consideration when conducting research for this thesis; they directly and indirectly relate to the forms of mobilisation exhibited in both neighbourhoods, the types of activities associated with the archaeological parks, as well as the attention provided to each space by the state.

4.4 Concluding Thoughts

This chapter is by no means a comprehensive view of the spaces’ extensive history, but acts as a guide to the themes explored in this study. It primarily utilised state-coordinated produced representations in order to explore the official narratives and interpretations attributed to the particular spaces. These revealed the ways in which state narratives and heritage management
practices have overshadowed the uses and appropriations of spaces by local communities as well as their participation in the protection and preservation of antiquities. Such narratives correspond to the deep-rooted professionalisation of archaeological practices in Greece. They demonstrate the deeply problematic archaeological ethics in place as well as the authoritative positioning of the discipline in Greek society. As such, they reveal the inherent sense of stewardship which overrides and eclipses local communities’ participation and contribution in protecting archaeological sites. Archaeologists present their work as a means to safeguard the past from the detriment of time and of modern uses, attributing their preservation solely to their own initiatives and interventions. It therefore comes as no surprise that they provide emphasis to their own efforts in protecting both spaces involved, creating almost a temporal gap between the past and the moment they came to the sites’ ‘rescue’ and reactivated their operation.

Another key point that needs to be highlighted is the cultural and historical value attributed to the spaces of interest through official mediums. In the case of Philopappou, its proximity to the Acropolis identifies it as a type of ‘protector’ to the Sacred Rock, ultimately relegating its significance in comparison to the national/international site. The emphasis ascribed to the classical remnants and history of the Western Hills renders them culturally significant, albeit through their associations with the classical period. Plato’s Academy on the other hand, despite being considered an important classical site receiving immense attention during ancient and modern times, failed to be included in the UAAS Programme and its location has further determined the nature of its promotion by state services in the present.

The chapter summarised the contestations which have taken place between residential movements and state services. It further presented the neighbourhoods surrounding the parks modern history, focusing on the sociopolitical and economic status of each location. This is supplemented by a demographic profile of each area in order to demonstrate the current socioeconomic conditions existing in the neighbourhoods. As such, this information intends to reveal the crucial connections between the frequency and types of activities local communities engage in at the parks, as well as their perceptions and their re-appropriations of these in the present.

Overall, this chapter exposed the disjuncture existing between archaeology and the public as well as the adverse top-to-bottom approaches utilised by archaeologists who dismiss communities which interact daily with archaeological sites. Official interpretations and descriptions of the spaces have traditionally omitted the role of local communities in the maintenance and protection of the parks. They project a singular, monochromatic representation of the spaces, deducing them solely to their archaeological and historical features despite their immense environmental significance, whilst simultaneously disregarding the multitemporality of antiquities and material traces that make the particular parks distinctive.
Chapter 5  On Theory and Method

One of the most vivid memories from my undergraduate studies at Southampton is a debate session with Professor Matthew Johnson on the importance of theory when conducting fieldwork. My fellow course mates and I were confident that as future archaeologists, we would surely be able to maintain a sense of scientific objectivity when dealing with the archaeological record. Professor Johnson articulately stressed the significance of a theoretical ‘toolset’ and the unavoidable effect of personal experiences, biases, cultural backgrounds and political convictions when performing fieldwork. I often think about his patience and determination to ignite our inner theoretical flame that day; debating with over thirty eighteen-year olds almost an hour after class dismissal, the least I can do is thank him for imparting his knowledge to us, fifteen years later.

This chapter presents the theories and methods selected for the materialisation of my thesis. It describes the key concepts utilised for the analysis of my research, as well as the methodologies I selected when entering the field. These tools support the overall purpose of this thesis—to re-evaluate the relationship between archaeological sites and the public. My aim is to bring to the fore the extra-official engagements and interactions of local communities with archaeological sites that juxtapose deep-rooted modernist experiences of archaeological heritage. As such, it examines the contemporary meanings, interpretations and perceptions of archaeological heritage of people who live them as part of their everyday lives, beyond the existing official narratives and associated heritage management practices.

I decided to tackle this complex relationship by centring my thesis on the archaeological parks of Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy, and the residents that live in close proximity to these. I selected the specific two spaces due to their status as open archaeological sites in an urban environment with a ‘dual’ function; they stand both as archaeological sites as well as leisure parks open to the public. More importantly, the particular spaces were also of interest to me due to the consistent acts of reclamation displayed by the residential communities. In order to gain a more holistic understanding of the activism associated with archaeological sites in Athens, my research draws links to other archaeological sites and their neighbouring communities throughout the city, reflected in this thesis through auto-ethnographic vignettes of my personal experiences and interactions with these.

Theoretically, I have employed a thematic triad as an analytical ‘portal’ in my endeavour. Namely, this triad encapsulates the spaces’ multi-layered temporality and materiality through the communities’ affective relationship with these; the numerous clashes associated with the parks’ protection, re-appropriation and status; as well as the complex identity politics existing at the heart of neighbouring local communities.
Methodologically, my research is based on the practical ethnographic tools utilised by archaeological ethnography. These are primarily constituted of qualitative (semi/un-structured) interviews with residential activists, as well as archaeologists, architects, artists and urban activists. It further involves substantial site and participant observation, as well as participation in various activities such as assemblies, protests, group discussions, and workshops. My fieldwork is complimented by archival research principally focused on resources produced by residential movements and associations, including newspapers, brochures, posters and social media activity, as well as official/public documents and information provided by state services.

The chapter ends with a personal experience which has unquestionably affected my perception of politics, praxis, and the right to the city, providing thus a more adequate idea of my sociopolitical positioning and self-reflective standpoint.

5.1 “Defining” Local Communities and Archaeological Parks

This research views local communities and localities as multifaceted and flexible entities. Taking into consideration that it deals with a particular set of individuals (primarily residential activists) within a greater, diverse community, fighting for the protection of a specific space, in a very particular timeframe—it is impossible to have a static, fixed notion and definition of what a local community means. Drawing from Massey’s (1994) work, localities, much like places, are continually reproduced through social practices. It is not possible or even fruitful to create boundaries and fixities when defining localities as they too are in fact processes, melding and taking different forms in time. It is necessary for any ethnographic endeavour to override “readily-produced” concepts of locality, and to recognise that each unique approach to a community is unavoidably shaped by the research questions being examined (Jones and Woods 2013: 39). The term ‘local community’ in the context of this research therefore is used to highlight and encompass the locality which actively mobilises in order to protect, use, and re-appropriate archaeological parks, and their efforts to maintain the parks’ integration in their daily lives and by extension in the city’s urban environment. It is also the amalgamation of the social relations created amongst individuals of different backgrounds, social and economic standings, as well as political convictions, created in relation to and because of their connectedness with space and its multi-layered/dimensional dynamics. As such, my work is aligned with the assertion made by Jones and Woods (ibid.) that localities do not exist solely in absolute spaces as bounded territories, as they can be expressed both in relative and relational space “where boundaries are at best ‘fuzzy’ and permeable”.

Much like local communities, archaeological parks do not have a rigid definition—an additional reason for the use of quotation marks in the title of this section. Before however delving into the relevant literature on the features that constitute archaeological parks, it is necessary to reiterate an
important point made in the introductory chapter of this thesis and again in the previous chapter. The archaeological sites of interest in this study are not officially declared or listed as “archaeological parks”. Philopappou Hill is listed as an “archaeological site” with a dual character—one that pertains to its archaeological significance and the other to its environmental quality and, by extension, its recreational purpose. Plato’s Academy’s status as an “archaeological grove” does not classify it as an “archaeological park” either—at least not according to the various definitions and interpretations attributed to global examples of archaeological parks. This is one of the unique features of the two particular spaces, and perhaps one of the reasons why they constitute prime examples for the potential change in managing archaeological sites in urban contexts in Greece; their official status directly clashes with their extra-official uses and perceptions of these as parks for leisurely use, raising significant questions concerning their appropriation and inclusion in the locals’ and city’s social lives. Their ‘hybrid’ nature has been discussed in various media outlets, and has further prompted a number of architectural, urban designing, and sociological studies (amongst others) in order to determine the optimum ways to further integrate these living spaces into the urban environment. Most prominently, the mobilisations of the Philopappou Residents’ Movement prompted Sifakis (2008) to ask: “‘Museum’ or breath?” reflecting on the rising debate between the hills’ ‘museumification’ and their capacity to provide an open, green space in the progressively ‘cementified’ city. This debate further raised questions regarding the hills’ identity in the public realm, as seen in an article in the newspaper *Kathimerini* entitled: “New dilemma: archaeological site or park?” (Rigopoulos 2009). Additionally, Sideris (2009) proposes an alternative approach for the protection and promotion of the Western Hills within the urban landscape. On the other hand however, several articles or studies for Plato’s Academy employ the archaeological grove as a central locus for the regeneration and re-development of the neighbourhood.40 The different approaches to these spaces reveals fundamental indications as to the use of these parks by local communities, the socioeconomic status of the neighbourhoods they are located in, as well as the changing nature of ‘hybrid’, open archaeological sites in the city.

Keeping the above in mind, there is no single interpretation of an archaeological park listed in international documents and legislations, nor does the Greek Law (No. 3028/2002) “On the Protection of Antiquities and Cultural Heritage in General” offer a direct definition of the term.41 Instead, the relevant literature on archaeological parks encompasses archaeological sites with varying characteristics, such as open-air museums, archaeological sites with reconstructions and/or educational activities, as well as constructed pathways to lead visitors through archaeological

---

40 See for example Stathopoulou’s (2010) proposal for a “network of intervention” in order to redesign the park and to make way for the incorporation of the pending Museum of the City of Athens (amongst others).

41 A notable recent study by Servou (2018) attempting to situate archaeological parks within the Greek context through the case of Kymisala in Rhodes can be accessed at: https://www.didaktorika.gr/eadd/handle/10442/44294 [Last Accessed 5 Feb. 2019].
remains in situ (amongst other features). The 2015 ICOMOS Oman Draft of Recommendations\textsuperscript{42} reviews archaeological heritage and associated management and conservation practices related to archaeological parks and sites, taking into consideration previous international documents (discussed below). The draft defines archaeological parks as a:

“\textit{link between scientific research and the public...a definable area distinguished by the value of heritage resources and land related to such resources, having the potential to become an interpretive, educational and recreational resource for the public, which should be protected and conserved.}”

\textsuperscript{(ICOMOS 2015)}

The ICOMOS Oman draft emphasises the importance of conservation, site management and protection, as well as visitor’s accessibility to parks and associated research materials. It does not however provide any further information regarding potential recreational uses and appropriations of archaeological parks. Most importantly, the role of local communities is minimal, with only two references relating to neighbouring residents; one concerns maintaining effective park management in order to respect communities’ environments whilst the other deals with systematic communication with “\textit{essential stakeholders at the international, national, and local level}”.

Breznik (2014: 7 cf. Breznik 2006: 90) further proposes defining an archaeological park as “\textit{an area under archaeological protection, supplemented with elements of a landscape (i.e. is tended as a park) where the archaeological remains are presented in situ in the open air}”. This general, ‘umbrella’ term suffices in providing a broader idea of what an archaeological park might entail. The fluidity of the concept can be easily applied to different forms of archaeological parks, especially since there are diverse characteristics which are associated with these types of spaces. Despite the flexibility of the term however, Breznik’s (2014: 185) work is centred on archaeological parks as “\textit{complex cultural-tourist product led organisations}” whose primary aim is to preserve heritage along with “\textit{supplementary for-profit activity}” ranging from shops, restaurants, snack bars, and other forms of commercial activity. This interpretation of an archaeological park does not coincide with neither of the spaces of interest in this study.

Bayraktar and Kubat’s (2010) study on archaeological parks in urban contexts in Istanbul focuses primarily on the spaces integration within public space, highlighting the need to incorporate archaeological parks into the everyday lives of local communities. The authors assert these spaces function as a way to “\textit{present the past to the public,...provide interpretive and educational opportunities on site, and provide recreational opportunities}” (ibid.: 10). This research therefore

\textsuperscript{42} Drafted at the international conference organised by at Dhofar University in Salalah, Sultanate of Oman, source available at: http://whc.unesco.org/document/135364 [Last Accessed 08/12/18].
utilises Breznik’s all-encompassing term (excluding the commercial element), with Bayraktar and Kubat’s dynamic integration of archaeological parks as living space within communities.

Despite the lack of an official definition of archaeological parks, there are charters that have relevant indications as to how archaeological sites and heritage must be managed. These however present guidelines for global application and their use can only be validated through regional and national entities. An important contribution was made in the Lausanne Charter that states:

“Active participation by the general public must form part of policies for the protection of archaeological heritage…Participation must be based upon access to the knowledge necessary for decision making. The provision of information to the general public is therefore an important element in integrated protection.”

(icomos 1990, Article 2)

The charter further incorporates the importance of “local commitment and participation” in order to promote the maintenance of archaeological heritage. It demonstrates the need for local communities of different compositions to be actively involved in the processes of protecting heritage, as well as being informed and included in decision-making processes.

Archaeological parks can be considered milestones in the development of innovative heritage management plans and practices to protect archaeological heritage whilst also engaging the public. They have also been known to promote tourist exploration of sites and by extension of localities, taking upon a more commercialised approach to the public engagement with archaeological heritage. The archaeological parks studied in this research are not directly exploited for commercial purposes, but are relentlessly affected by the general neoliberalising practices imposed upon the city. They constitute open archaeological sites which are accessible to the public at all hours, without the imposition of an entrance fee. They contain informational panels scattered in different locations throughout the spaces, providing historical backgrounds of selected monuments and visible archaeological remains, and are frequently used for educational purposes by state services, schools and others.

43 Other notable and relevant charters include Article 4 of the Verona Charter (1997) dealing with ancient places of performance. The Charter asserts that there needs to be a balance between the need to protect monuments and “the expectations of audiences, visitors and local residents” (Article 4, Par. iii). This particular section informs the use of archaeological sites and is elaborately named “Enhancing sites by using them”. Also, The Burra Charter (2013, Article 12) also makes reference to the public’s participation in the process of conservation, interpretation and management, “the people for whom the place has significant associations and meanings, or who have social, spiritual or other cultural responsibilities of the place”.

44 A prime example of such an endeavour is the European Archaeological Park of Bliesbruck Reinheim (http://www.archeo57.com) [Last Accessed: 08/12/2018].
5.2 Theorising the Sociality of Archaeological Sites

Stroula and Sutton (2010: 7) argue that archaeological sites are often discussed in a disembodied manner, relating them to archaeologically understood contexts of time, space, and natural environment, but not much more. This creates what they refer to as “partial landscapes” which in turn produce partial meanings, often rendering archaeology an instrument of alienation, despite—more often than not—good intentions (ibid.). This is why I have selected the concept of temporality as an essential theoretical tool of this study. Temporality simultaneously captures notions of time, space, materiality and memory. It adheres to Ingold’s (1993: 152) theoretical and phenomenological approach as intrinsically linked to the landscape, understood as a story enfolding “the lives and times of predecessors who, over the generations, have moved around in it and played a part in its formation”. Ingold’s conceptualisation of a temporalised landscape consisting of taskscapes—an array of social activities (or ‘dwelling activities’) within a landscape performed by individuals or groups—ultimately “owes its character to the experiences it affords to those who spend time there” (ibid.: 155). My research draws from this approach, highlighting the importance of the multi-temporality of sites, their materiality, and the multiplicity of social activities that contribute to the formation of temporalised landscapes. It follows Hamilakis’s (2013: 122-123) entanglement of sensoriality with material memory and time, the multitemporality of material things and their central role in “corporeal engagements and interactions” with people throughout time. It views the senses as multi-temporal, entailing the simultaneous co-existence of perception and memory, allowing thus our engagement with materiality to evoke the multiplicity of durational qualities of matter (ibid. 24). The activities ‘performed’ by local communities in the spaces of interest thus present modern engagements to otherwise static, decontextualised spaces, embodying the present cultural biography of sites which are often overshadowed by official archaeological narratives and practices.

This thesis further adopts Foucault’s (1984: 47) conceptualisation of heterotopias as spaces of high societal value existing within society but simultaneously ‘untouchable’ from it, despite the ability to “indicate their location in reality”. It views enclosed archaeological sites as heterotopias; spaces that are confined, demarcated and frozen in time within a hegemonic context, which does not allow them to exist in synchrony with society. Heterotopias are therefore juxtaposed to spaces that are used in people’s everyday lives, and yet are inaccessible to them. They are perceived as ‘sacred’ places that embody the nation’s imaginings with highly charged significations, much like places of worship that should not be ‘tainted’ by the present. This sanctification creates a distance and sense of mystification as opposed to the real, lived spaces surrounding them.

This thesis critically assesses the conflicts and dissonance persisting between local communities and state services due to exclusionary practices created by ‘heterotopian’ politics. My work is theoretically fuelled by discourses advocating for an emancipatory praxis within the discipline of
archaeology, advancing, as McGuire (2008: 3) notes, “the interests of the marginalized and the oppressed against the interests of the dominant”. It approaches the main chapters by reflecting on the clashes that have transpired throughout the years in the spaces of interest, through Lefebvre’s (1968) concept of the right to the city. My work is aligned with Lefebvre’s idea on the city’s production reflecting the people’s needs for socialising, for security, for expressing culture and for their aspirations. His work stresses the importance of being able to participate in producing the space one inhabits, rather than allowing a capitalist system to have control over the process of urban development and the production of urban space without taking into account people’s needs. The iconic philosopher/sociologist’s concept of the right to the city is an integral component for the progress of this study, highlighting the people’s right to participate in producing and shaping the urban space they live in.

In addition, the multifaceted concept of identity further complements the theoretical and practical approaches to the themes of temporality and contestation in researching the sociality of archaeological sites. By adopting a constructivist approach, this thesis utilises the theories and concepts that best define the formulation of nationalism (Chapter 2) and its catalytic role in the dynamic between local and national identity. It views nationalism as a modernist construct (Gellner 1983; Anderson 2006; Hobsbawm 1992)—a necessary political tool for the consolidation of power and political legitimacy. Subsequently, and in regards to the Greek case, this thesis adopts the view that antiquity and archaeology hold a central role in the construction of national identity and imagination during the formation years of the nation-state (Gourgouris 1996; Hamilakis 2007a; Herzfeld 1982; Leontis 1995). By extension, it directly relates to the gap existing between archaeology and the public, and provides a critical view on the practices of exclusion which result from top to bottom disciplinary practices. As such, my work investigates the existing gaps between national and local identity, the state and the public, and official and unofficial heritage management practices and discourses.

In discussing the politics of identity, it is integral to consider the multileveled interplay between national and local identity. This involves comparisons, overlapping features, appropriations, and saturation—primarily from national to local (Gellner 1983: 57). Despite fuelling one another to a certain degree, this relationship is characterised by uneven dynamics, the national imposing over the local, selectively integrating the most ‘suitable’ and desirable elements from the latter in order to supplement any possible gaps in its narrative. This imbalance functions at the expense of the local, ultimately resulting in the loss of crucial cultural components, narratives and appropriations, which are deemed, much like Gellner (ibid.) proposes, non-significant. Diligent conservation, protection and promotion of archaeological sites in many ways echo the imbalance existing between the local and national. This parallel is manifested in the dissimilar treatment afforded to sites with national or international prominence—those receiving special attention and care—and those that do not directly relate to the ‘default’ symbolic capital of Greece. This discrepancy
demonstrates the process in which the overarching national narrative overshadows local narratives, much like tangible heritage—in this case, archaeological sites such as the Acropolis—overshadow other ‘local’ sites (Yalouri 2001; Caftanzoglou 2001). In a city like Athens which functions as a central ‘figure’ in the nation’s imagined cultural inheritance—while simultaneously home to diverse localities and archaeological sites—the intangible and tangible disjuncture between local and national is heightened. Therefore, the development of a local identity within this framework becomes somewhat problematic and the importance of space in the formation of identity—especially in localities with archaeological sites—often clashes with the superimposed national narrative and identity. Furthermore, within the theoretical context of crypto-colonialism (Herzfeld 2002) and the reality of neoliberalism, this thesis approaches the archaeological spaces in Athens’ urban landscape through the historical trajectories leading to the present and the repercussions of these on heritage, localities and the relationship between the two. It explores the effects of national egotism at the expense of localities and heritage in an effort to be accepted into western political, economic and social structures.

The interplay between local and national identity also connects to the concept of the right to the city discussed above. The types of relationships created between individuals in a specific environment contributes to the varying types of engagement with space. This thesis views the formation of identification of a community or an individual with space as a complex structure with varying points of entry. As such, it coincides with Jenkins’ (2008) emphasis on similarities that bring local communities together in regards to a shared space, allowing for the creation of a horizontal, collective dynamic that enables them to actively protect spaces of interest. This thesis also follows Stuart Hall’s (1996) opposing emphasis on relationships of difference, which are created through systematic practices of exclusion. By combining the two interpretative schemes, my thesis views Jenkins’ view as a more intimate form of identity, an ‘internal’ one sharing both similarities and differences amongst collectivities and sense of identity and place and Hall’s ‘external’ force—one that allows communities to differentiate themselves from institutions and state series which impose their policies and reconfigurations in their environments.

Within the local vs. national framework, Foucault’s (1984) concept of heterotopias and their ‘sanctified’ status in society becomes relevant once more. This concept enables a deeper understanding of the existence of archaeological sites in another ‘dimension’, one that is located outside the present context, situated by the ‘sacred’ processes that produced the nation and its imagination. These heterotopias are linked to the hegemonic status of the national, creating a substantial distance with the local. Despite the fact that some archaeological sites are open to the public, they still maintain the essence of a heterotopia, and are in dire need of desanctification and further integration within the general public sphere.

With these theoretical elements at hand, this thesis challenges the intellectual and methodological gap existing between archaeology and the public. It aims to provide an alternative view of the
particular archaeological parks, reveal their social lives as part of the greater urban environment as well as the neighbouring communities which experience them daily.

5.3 Excavating Narratives: An Archaeological Ethnography

There is no one standard methodological ‘recipe’ when exploring both the micro and macro themes of this research. As is evident through the theoretical concepts discussed above and more extensively in Chapters 2 and 3, the reflexive relationship between space, time and contemporary communities within a specific sociopolitical and economic context requires a flexible and wide-ranging approach. Such an approach can highlight the varying dynamics, perceptions, significations and alternative interpretations existing beyond official narratives and discourses. My research thus employs methodological tools from the field of Archaeological Ethnography as it comprehensively utilises and merges diverse techniques, methods and multidisciplinary approaches, practices and discourses. These most notably include: formal/informal interviews, participant and site observations, archival research, ethnographic and other participatory events, performative and art installations (Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos 2009: 67). These methods are largely context dependent as Meskell (2005: 83) asserts, allowing for a holistic and relevant methodology when approaching archaeological sites and communities.

It is important to note that archaeology’s recent “ethnographic turn” (Castañeda 2008) has been in the ‘making’ for quite some time now; ethnography has been a key feature of archaeological fieldwork for decades, initially providing an “ethnographic approach to the study of contemporary, living human societies that seeks to identify behavioural realities that structure the potential archaeological record” (Gould 1989: 3; see also Watson 1979; David and Kramer 2001). In time, the ethical responsibilities associated with the interpretations of the past, matters of ownership, and the impact of archaeological heritage in the lives of contemporary people, gradually transformed the practice of ethnography to a more effective and socially relevant tool in the present. It predominantly did so by developing a more reflexive stance towards the archaeological record and the communities living in close proximity to, or associated with, archaeological sites (see Faulkner 2002; Fotiades 1993; Hodder 2000; 2003).

In more recent years, ethnography and its reflexive quality has been utilised in various forms closely associated with archaeological ethnography, such as in the fields of Ethnography of Archaeology (Edgeworth 2006; Holtorf 2006), as well as Ethnographic Archaeology (Castañeda and Matthews 2008). The first, according to Edgeworth (2016: 15-16), allows for the exploration of archaeological practice and the production of archaeological knowledge, enabling researchers to “shift in and out of focus, to change stances, to take up new perspectives, to reflect critically on established viewpoints, and to look at things in new and surprising ways”. As such, Edgeworth affirms it is through this additional ‘dimension’ to the study of the past that enriches archaeological
knowledge; it includes the “archaeological observer and the practical and social contexts of observation”, allowing thus ethnographies of archaeological practice to provide a more holistic look at the past in the present and the present in the past (ibid.). Despite the reflexive nature of Ethnography of Archaeology in re-evaluating the archaeological process and its ontological place both on a scholarly level but also within a given social scope, it is limited to “top-down” methods and does not systematically incorporate the communities that are reclaiming archaeological heritage. Similarly, ethnographic archaeology as attested by Castañeda and Matthews (2008:16), integrates ethnography into archaeology in order to “study different aspects of archaeological research, the social contexts of research projects, and the interface of archaeology with stakeholder and publics”. The authors emphasise the critical contributions to archaeological knowledge provided by the ever-changing social constructions of contemporary society, and the need for ethnographic archaeology to bring these to the fore. Much like the former, ethnographic archaeology places a greater focus on the implications and consequences of socially constructed archaeological knowledge upon the profession and discipline of archaeology, without systematically providing a proactive platform to the socially constructed element itself; it views the sociality of archaeological knowledge from a scholarly/disciplinary distance, and is not necessarily inclusive of alternative views of archaeological heritage. In other words, its primary focus is to investigate the production of knowledge and the research positioning of projects, in order to then “proactively engage stakeholder communities” (Castañeda 2008: 57).

Archaeological Ethnography combines theoretical and methodological elements from the above fields, but its prominent distinction in my view is that it engages diverse publics in a more horizontal manner, considering thus official archaeology as “only one amongst many frameworks that produce discourses and practices on material things” (Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos 2009: 67). It investigates the sociopolitical contexts of the discipline and its engagement with society, but simultaneously allows for multivocal interpretations and perceptions of archaeological knowledge through dialogic and reflexive methods. As proposed by Meskell (2005: 83), archaeological ethnography is a “hybrid practise”, drawing from both archaeology and anthropology for a more informed look into contextual circumstances as well as “multiple understandings of [a] site”. My research closely associates with Meskell’s view, as it considers the distinctive features of the spaces of interest, the neighbouring communities, but also the complex social and political conditions at present—formed by a dialectic relationship between the global and the local. As such, it further draws from Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos (2009: 67) view of archaeological ethnography as “a highly contested and thus fertile cross-disciplinary as well as transcultural, politically loaded space; a space for multiple conversations, engagements, interventions, and

45 The authors note that the use of the word ‘transcultural’ involves crossing disciplinary, cultural and social boundaries such as ethnic, national, class, gender or age etc. They have borrowed the term from Castañeda (2008).
critiques, centred on materiality and temporality”. In doing so, it focuses on the idiosyncrasies of the spaces’ materialities and temporalities; it explores their sensuous and affective conceptions through their interaction with contemporary communities. Most importantly, it utilises ethnographic methods in order to investigate the diverse public meanings and values of these spaces in the present. Therefore, this thesis employs ethnography in order to investigate the extra-official heritage discourses and management practices existing in association to the spaces of interest; it is directly contrary to Castañeda’s (2008: 28) view of ethnographic methods practiced through the mode of archaeological ethnography as “subordinated”, primarily used in order to understand and explain the past.

5.4 Application

The following table presents a summarised version of selected activities I engaged in for the materialisation of this thesis between 2012 and 2017, in chronological order. An extended version can be found in Appendix C. Namely, my research involved participant and site observations, interviews, archival research, workshops (seminars, group discussions, assemblies), as well as extensive documentation of the above through various means (journal entries, photographs, personal notes, sound recordings). The sections below discuss the details of the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plato’s Academy</td>
<td>March 2012-August 2017</td>
<td>Site and Participant Observations/photographs, personal notes, sound recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato’s Academy</td>
<td>2012-2017</td>
<td>Leisure activities with friends (evening walks, star-gazing, picnics, bike-riding, football, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>2012-2017</td>
<td>British School at Athens/Archival Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>2013-2018</td>
<td>Accumulation of newspaper articles, social media content, official public documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>ELSTAT (Acquisition of Census and Maps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato’s Academy</td>
<td>June 27-29, 2014</td>
<td>Three Day Festival (Discussions on matters affecting park, concerts, activities, food). Participation in activities, photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerameikos</td>
<td>October 31, 2014</td>
<td>Public Reading at Demosion Sema. Participation/personal notes (Part of Microgeographies, Reveries and Realities Project. Coordinator: Harikleia Haris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mets, Athens</td>
<td>November 9, 2014</td>
<td>Group Discussion with Ardittos Association concerning archaeological site of the Temple of Artemis Agrotera and public archaeology. Part of Microgeographies &quot;Revification of Ancient Ruins&quot; Project, Coordinator: Harikleia Haris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>January 9, 2015</td>
<td>Dialogues in Archaeology Conference/ Citizens in Action Workshop and Presentation on Plato's Academy/coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens/Pilopoioio Poulopoulos</td>
<td>February 28, 2015</td>
<td>Meeting with activists/archaeologists/architects and artists from various movements- action for protection of archaeological spaces/coordination, material preparation, photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>April-June 2015</td>
<td>Assemblies to discuss environmental matters of the hill/participation, photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato's Academy and Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>April-November 2015, January-May 2016, June-August 2017</td>
<td>Recorded, semi-structured interviews with local residents/activists/archaeologists/artists/architects. Some peripatetic on site, others at cafés or participants’ homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>June-July 2017</td>
<td>Guerrilla plant-watering and discussions concerning the hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4** Overview of research methodology according to location, date, and activity/method utilised.

### 5.4.1 Participant and Site Observation

Similarly to Meskell’s (2005: 83) research at Kruger Park, my research entailed an incalculable amount of “hanging out”. It involved an improvisational component which—especially during the early stages of my fieldwork—was necessary. This was important as it allowed me to experience...
the ‘micro-societies’ engaging with the archaeological parks from almost an ‘insider’s’ perspective; despite being Greek and familiar with the general cultural setting, the language, and the sociopolitical context, it was imperative to immerse myself within the specific neighbourhoods. I thus set out on an endeavour which was strangely ‘close to home’, whilst simultaneously quite far from it. As such, the initial stages of my fieldwork were predominately composed of a more ‘traditional’ notion of participant and site observation. I was always sure to carry my notebook with me as to record my observations, thoughts and feelings, as well as my camera—to take pictures of social activities and daily uses of the spaces, as well as interactions that I found particularly interesting or even intriguing. Moreover, the camera also functioned as a digital diary in its own right; taking into consideration my part-time enrolment as a PhD student, the sometimes subtle or even greater changes in the archaeological sites and surrounding neighbourhoods in the last six years were more often than not better captured by the device than by my own writing. These moments were eventually supplemented by sound recordings of the spaces during my participant and site observations (see Appendix D for examples of site observation notes). These were initially a way for me to become more familiar with the sensorial elements of the sites beyond their visual and tactile qualities. At first, it prompted me to become more attuned to the various sounds surrounding me, allowing for a deeper understanding of the intangible materialities existing within the particular environments. It was almost as if I was trying to train my brain to become more aware of my surroundings through a multisensory approach; eventually, I used the sound recordings when writing notes and composing my chapters, which I found functioned as a mnemonic ‘booster’ when conceptualising and developing my thoughts on the spaces of interest. Over the course of this research, an additional factor which complimented my experience of the archaeological sites of Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy, were the occasional leisure activities I indulged in with friends. These included evening walks, star-gazing, picnics, bike riding, football and others. These activities allowed me to create a more personal relationship with the spaces beyond my research, setting notebooks, cameras and recording devices to the side in order to appreciate the spaces on a different level.

5.4.2 Interviews

My research is further based on interviews with local residential activists, artists, architects, archaeologists and urban geographers primarily associated with the spaces of interest. There are twenty main participants which I met with on a systematic basis and was able to conduct more than one interview in the course of my research. Sixteen of these participants have provided at least one (in some cases two) recorded interviews for the purposes of this study (see Appendix E for a list of participants and interviews provided). A number of our follow-up interviews were conducted without the use of a recording device, for which I kept notes of the main points of discussion, along with my personal observations and notes (see Appendix F). Since all interviews were conducted in Greek, major extracts from each interview were transcribed and further translated (by myself) for
the purposes of this research (see Appendix G for example of primary coded notes of interview before transcription/translation).

Additionally, there are several other participants that I have interacted and held discussions with in numerous environments—workshops, conferences, assemblies, events—which have further shaped this study and have participated/collaborated in events initiated by me or by residential associations without however contributing recorded interviews. For the purpose of this research, I have changed the names for most participants, apart from the individuals who provided permission to be listed by name.

For the majority of my ethnographic fieldwork, the interviews were semi-structured; this allowed for a more flexible approach to the qualitative component of this study. Before meeting with participants, I created a set of questions modified to participants’ profession, practice or active engagement with the sites—both on an everyday basis but also through their activist mobilisation. These questions were particularly useful for the first set of interviews I recorded; eventually, having gained more experience with the types of narratives involved, as well as the relationship I developed with participants, these interviews became less structured and formal. This was an organic transition; it is a testament to the rapport I was lucky to create with participants in time through long-term involvement—yet another benefit of conducting ethnographic research on a part-time basis. The semi/un-structured interviews allowed participants to be more open about their personal experiences with the relevant spaces, as well as the clashes that have taken place in recent years. It was almost an unconscious decision from a certain point on as the conversations I engaged in had a formative flow which provided for characteristics of interaction between communities and spaces which were previously unknown to me to emerge.

Tim Ingold’s and Jo Lee Vergunst’s (2008) collection of studies involving “ethnography and practice on foot” have further enabled me to explore the various sensorial prospects diverse ‘ways of walking’ have to offer; through this alternative ethnographic method, I was able to capture participants’ personal views, memories, experiences of and values attributed to different places, in an engaging and holistic way (Figure 5.1). This method was perhaps one of the most productive and valuable ones in comparison to interviews that took place in cafés or homes. Apart from the interactive nature of walking whilst interviewing participants, the movement itself was a directive important for this research. Where did they choose to take me and why? Why did we choose specific paths to walk and not others? These walks through the spaces of interest unlocked new and unpredicted topic discussions, key to qualitative interviews. I was given the opportunity to discover new places and new facets of the spaces I was researching, through my participants’ experiences, and to gain further insight in the complex ways they perceive and engage with archaeological parks.
Figure 5.1 Ways of Walking—Maggie, furry activist and member of the Philopappou Movement, leading the way around the Hill (2016).

Through peripatetic interviews/discussions, meetings at cafés or participants’ homes, I was able to collect extensive narratives regarding the spaces of interest and locals’ experiences of these, as well as their general perceptions concerning the impact of the crisis and state intervention to the spaces in question. On average, the duration of interviews were between two and three hours. Beyond these recordings however, I met with most of my participants on various occasions without my recording device, sometimes to discuss matters concerning the archaeological parks of interest and the movements/activism associated with these, and others simply to enjoy a coffee/drink. I believe this to be important for two reasons: it allowed participants to express themselves without the pressure of the presence of a recording device whilst also giving us the opportunity to develop our relationship beyond the bounds of this thesis. For the purposes of this study, I have used excerpts from my discussions with three residents from each neighbourhood. This is done primarily for two reasons: first, they were the ones I met most frequently with; and second, it felt important to maintain a consistent narrative from the people I established a stronger rapport with, rather than interrupting the flow of the study with excerpts from additional participants.
5.4.3 Archival Research

The qualitative component of this study is supported by extensive archival research. Historical archives inform the historicity and documented historical backgrounds of the archaeological parks presented in this paper. A considerable amount of these archives are representative of the official narratives and appropriations ascribed to these spaces. These include official records from the spaces’ excavations, as well as promotional/touristic brochures and websites created by the Ministry of Culture. A very significant part of my research depends on official documents relating to governmental/institutional decisions and modifications of space, most of which reflect the processes and practices undertaken by state services directly affecting the use and appropriation of the archaeological spaces of interest. In regards to the activity attributed to residential movements and associations, my research makes use of the diverse brochures, leaflets, newspapers/magazines, photographs, videos, posters and statements they produce, as well as their activity on social media (Facebook groups/events, blogs, etc.) For the most part, a number of public documents relating to the spaces, as well as past material such as video recordings of assemblies, leaflets, posters and brochures have been offered to me by a number of participants I have been in contact with since 2012. I consider myself extremely lucky to be able to have access to participants’ comprehensive and well-organised archives, as it would be severely time-consuming and difficult to acquire most of the documents needed for the progress of this thesis.

Through the use of sociological and urban geographical ‘subtools’, my research reflects on the theoretical and practical aspects of the communities’ identification within their surrounding environments. More specifically, it draws attention to their connection to their neighbourhoods, the archaeological parks within their proximity and the interplay between these spaces and the broader urban environment within which they operate. This cross-disciplinary mode of research allows for an open and flexible methodology in order to explore different facets of the communities’ concept of identity within a given context as well as their relationship with the study’s spaces of interest. Furthermore, the disciplines of urban geography and social anthropology have further provided a platform through which to understand current social and urban structures. My research utilises these approaches in order to present a micro-ethnography of each space (Chapter 4), involving not only the historical and archaeological information and nature of sites, but also the contemporary activities that take place in these spaces and the issues associated with them (Chapters 6 and 7). These are primarily consisted of photographs, maps, notes and recordings from each case study, as well as detailed descriptions of clashes and key events through commentaries provided by interlocutors.

In order to gain a stronger understanding of the consequences of urban restructuring and the nature of urban movements, it was necessary to become more familiar with the disciplines of social anthropology, urban geography and urban sociology. These were utilised in order to evaluate the
effects of the current sociopolitical and economic crisis on Greek society and the processes through which this crisis has affected contact with archaeological spaces. David Harvey’s (1996; 2000; 2004; 2008; 2009; 2012) extensive work on the changes imposed upon urban infrastructures for the benefit of capitalist and neoliberal schemes has significantly stimulated and influenced the type of literature I felt was closer to the paradigms presented in this thesis. Harvey’s work has contributed substantially to the establishment of a more critically and politically attuned discipline of urban geography, particularly through a Marxist theoretical and methodological approach. Complemented by the works of various urban geographers and sociologists asserting the processes of deregulation of urban planning and the resulting privatisation of public space and property (Petropoulou et al. 2016), to matters of neighbourhood gentrification (Alexandri 2015; 2018), the Greek experience of the imposition of neoliberalising urbanisation and its effects on the environmental, urban and social landscape (Dalakoglou and Vradis 2011; Dalakoglou 2013; Stavrides 2014), this thesis utilises a quantitative approach in order to support its qualitative findings. Through the demographic composition of different neighbourhoods (presented in Chapter 4), it explores the consequences of the crisis, and effectively the extent in which neighbourhood social and economic status affects the multiplicity of interactions with sites.

5.4.4 Workshops, Seminars, Group Discussions, Assemblies

The broader political ramifications of the crisis have further prompted a wave of participatory design teams involving active stakeholders in the use, protection and promotion of cultural and public spaces. The existence of such teams in addition to urban movements attest to the substantial decrease in available public spaces as a result of neoliberal urban reconfigurations; moreover, it highlights the need for society’s participation in the production of the city, as well the desire to enjoy the city without having to deal with imposed fees. Coinciding with this movement, I have had the opportunity to organise workshops and discussion groups concerning archaeological spaces in Athens with a diverse group of people, including local activists, architects, archaeologists, heritage specialists, artists and urbanists (see Figure 5.2). These activities have brought to the fore additional ideas and discussions regarding the use and ‘reactivation’ of archaeological spaces and their prospective usage in dealing with social injustices.
It was, nonetheless, somewhat intimidating to approach local activists when I first initiated my research to discuss issues regarding archaeological heritage in their neighbourhoods. This was due to my capacity as a student of archaeology, as I was aware of the existing suspicions local residents held in regards to archaeologists and the numerous clashes between the two. Fortunately, I was well-received from the very beginning. It was perhaps only in one case—a group discussion regarding the archaeological site of the Temple of Artemis Agrotera in the district of Mets,46 that I sensed the residents’ cultural association ‘holding their breaths’ until I expressed my perspectives and views concerning public involvement in heritage practices (see Figure 5.3). Since then, I have been actively involved in a number of activities organised by the association, including a joint presentation at Panteion University (Athens) with a local artist and member of the association. Ironically, when introducing myself to the director of archaeological works at Philopappou Hill (in 2012), she was very apprehensive of my motives, concerned that I would critique her work for the archaeological park. Luckily, I was able to contact her again since, which resulted in a four-hour recorded conversation/interview about her work and her perspectives on the numerous clashes between her team and local residents.

---

46 A classical site that is completely off limits to the public, as it is enclosed with aluminum panels.
My introduction to members of the Philopappou residential movement was fruitful from the very beginning; I was invited to participate in coordination meetings, poster-postings and assemblies, amongst others (Figures 5.4-5.6). We maintained frequent communication throughout the years concerning issues that affected the hill, upcoming meetings and events. It is fair to say that most of the information that I discovered about the hill and the surrounding communities go beyond the recorded interviews; our exchanges whilst walking around the neighbourhoods to post posters (for upcoming assemblies) were perhaps the most helpful activities I was involved in, as it provided me with a stronger understanding of the general vicinity surrounding the archaeological park, the people, its history and the interconnection amongst them all. Guerrilla water-planting comes a close second; these meetings were both productive and educational (in terms of discovering and supporting the hill’s flora). Most importantly, tending to the hill was also a new way to interact with it, whilst discussing updates on legal matters affecting it.
Figure 5.4 Philopappou Movement Assembly at the Loumbardiaris Café, 2015.
Figure 5.5 Residents assemble to discuss matters concerning the hills, and the protection of Orlof Park (in photo) from private entities seeking to utilise it for company buildings (2016).

Figure 5.6 The Philopappou Residents’ Movement are joined by passersby in their assembly addressing the potential privatisation of the archaeological park’s foothills (Dionysiou Areopagitou, 2017).
5.4.5 Reflexivity through Autoethnography

An integral part of this thesis involves autoethnography based on my observations, experiences and reflexive investigation. This allows to convey a better understanding of the qualitative component of my research, evoking elements of my investigation, such as personal experiences, thoughts and feelings shared by my participants, as well as my reactions and interpretations of these, which would otherwise be lost in the process. As such, these accounts can capture the full range of ideas and viewpoints regarding alternative interactions with archaeological sites today; they also take into account their contemporary cultural biography through unofficial heritage discourses.

To a certain degree, having been raised in Athens gave me a ‘head-start’ in terms of my familiarity with the general social context of this research. In the case of Philopappou Hill, I had my own personal memories and experiences, as my family and I would frequently visit my aunt and uncle living in the neighbouring district of Petralona. My fondest memories include kite-flying and picnicking amongst the ancient remnants. Despite these childhood memories and engagement with the space, it was necessary to become re-acquainted with the hill and with the local community living nearby. Our initial discussions were centred on their clashes with the archaeological service and, in time, evolved into broader political, social and even personal matters. In one case, that of Dimosthenis—a retired army officer—our conversations regarding the Philopappou Hill lead to us meeting twice a month to discuss philosophical matters, while walking around the hill with his dog, Maggie—“the furry activist” as we agreed to call her. On the other hand, I was completely unfamiliar with Plato’s Academy. I had heard of the archaeological space, but I had never visited it before initiating my research. This ‘clean’ start allowed for a fresh approach to the park and the surrounding community. In time, I discovered that a lot of the political activities/assemblies regarding general social injustices (unrelated to matters of the park) were very close to my personal political convictions. This enabled me to form relationships with members of collectivities which shared similar political views and were involved in analogous hangouts and groups I was personally involved in at the time.

My experiences are reflected through the personal notes and journal entries I kept during—but mainly after—specific encounters (see Appendix H for example). I focused a lot on the subtle cues that oftentimes are missed in recordings; these are usually denoted by pauses in the audio files, but I was able to fill in those ‘gaps’ when returning to the file and noting facial or other expressions that potentially went unrecorded. Moreover, I recorded my own personal feelings and thoughts in regards to each of my meetings. Taking into consideration that I met with a variety of people from different sociopolitical and educational backgrounds with diverse agendas relating to the spaces of interest, my qualitative interviews consist of an array of perceptions and ideas in regards to the significations attributed to sites; it was therefore essential to reflect on these discussions in a
comprehensive manner, to find similarities and differences amongst participants, and to assess my personal perspective on what had been discussed.

Going back to recordings on several occasions throughout the time I was conducting my research, prompted me to gain more insight into what it was I was investigating. Due to the nature of qualitative interviews, I was able to acquire ‘new knowledge’ just by simply going back after a certain period of time and re-discovering something someone might have said through a different light and perspective. This was an important part of my autoethnographic process, as I could compare my initial notes and journal entries to earlier ones and reach a more precise conclusion on various matters discussed. This enabled a form of reflexivity which allowed me to reflect on the process of my ethnographic endeavour, and prompted me to self-reflect in the ways I had changed as a result of initiating this particular research (cf. Ellis et al. 2010). Nevertheless, as Marshall et al. (2009: 227) describe in their autoethnographic feminist project at Greenham, this thesis and my interpretations of my research are the result of an “inevitably partial and historically situated” account of myself, my encounters with spaces and local communities and the relationships I created with both at a particular time in my life. While conducting my fieldwork, I was constantly aware of the fact that I was recording a particular moment in time in a specific time, place, social and political context, with unique individuals. It is almost overwhelming to consider how many different strands of information are interlinked in order to create a holistic idea of how these archaeological sites operate within an urban context, in relation to locals’ everyday lives and in regards to their overarching national narrative/discourse.

Working in these locations was a way for me to become reintroduced to them from a very new perspective. This however does not necessarily mean that I purposely put on my theoretical and methodological ‘hat’ and went on identifying key ethnographic aspects that I felt would fit into my own thesis. It meant that I had to become more open in the way I viewed these spaces, become more intrinsically aware of their complex nature on a whole new level. When approaching a space, certain cultural and personal ‘filters’ inherently affect the way one experiences and interacts with a site; particular aspects of identity may come into play, which subconsciously, affect the way one perceives and interacts with a space. Despite having studied archaeology under the influence of progressive professors and educational environments, I was able to detect almost a ‘default’ sense of what archaeological sites are and how we are supposed to interact with one another. I started to feel as if I was re-developing an inner clash between a younger version of myself which was taught not to ‘touch’ ancient artefacts and not to make noise within a museum, and at first I felt like I had to shake it off and remind myself that I have ‘outgrown’ such mentalities and ways of thought.

Breaking these bounds was no simple task; phenomenological and sensorial approaches to the field (see Hamilakis 2013; Johnson 2012) embodied a collectively experiential approach through which I was able to interact and engage with archaeological spaces, their multi-temporality and their active presence within the greater urban and social context. My personal journals reflect on the
multisensoriality of sites through my own bodily perceptions, understandings, sensorial and affective experiences. These enabled me to identify and reflect on the multisensoriality of urban space and archaeological sites, that is, by holistically engaging through all bodily senses and not exclusively through a visual modality. This approach has allowed for the interweaving of these spaces’ sensorial experience in conjunction with their multi-temporality, revealing the alternative and synchronistic interaction between remnants of the past and present reality of archaeological heritage within the Athenian urban pastiche.

5.5 The (Complete) Loss of [My] Political Innocence

“Stop running!” yelled a man standing beside me to the stampeding crowd running towards his direction and splitting on his either side. “That’s what they want us to do!”

Mere minutes ago, my friends Electra, Christos and I had bought three beers from a kiosk and headed south towards Omonoia Square. We had just participated in a relatively peaceful demonstration to commemorate the death of Alexandros Grigoropoulos who was shot by a police officer on December 6, 2008. At this point however, we were unaware of what was happening a couple hundred meters north from where we were standing: the riot police had just arrived with water cannons, clearing a crowd of hundreds of people towards our direction. We started running towards Agiou Konstantinou Street, in an effort to avoid the Delta police squad from striking us with their batons while they rode their motorbikes through the crowd. I stopped beside the man who was yelling, trying to make sense of everything that was happening: alarms blaring, people running, shouting and screaming, fires in garbage bins being sprung in every direction, and tear gas slowly burning my eyes and throat. My adrenaline level was far too high for me to stand beside the yelling man any longer; my instincts forced me to keep running towards the opposite direction. For a few seconds, I lost Electra and Christos—they too were running away from the baton-bearing police officers. I was momentarily reunited with Electra, after the first wave had driven by. We tried to make a quick escape plan—this was our first time in a demonstration such as this one. Before we were able to decide, a second round of Delta team officers drove by. Electra managed to escape through a narrow opening behind a closed kiosk on the sidewalk, but I unfortunately didn’t make it through; the last thing I remember from that moment was being pushed against a closed shop hitting my head on the way, and a police officer bashing me repeatedly with his baton from top to bottom.

I had a broken elbow, multiple bruises all over my body and a smashed phone (which ultimately protected my lower stomach from any internal injuries).

I still think about the ‘yelling man’. Should I have stopped running? Was it really what they wanted? To chase anyone who goes against their authority? To this day, I’m not so sure. But I do know that things have changed radically in the way I perceive things.
My personal experience from the night of December 6, 2014 is not unique. It did however occur almost two years into my research and effectively strengthened my personal sense of injustice against the system and by extension, the struggles of urban movements and communities. I decided to share this memory as it marked a significant moment in my life at a time when I had become more involved in different forms of social mobilisation but most importantly to highlight the potential ‘effects’ of my experience in my personal perception, approach, and interpretation of the elements constituting my research. I felt it would be necessary to do so, as the notion of autoethnography as described by Reed-Danahay (1997: 3) “foregrounds the multiple nature of selfhood and opens up new ways of writing about social life”.

5.6 Concluding Thoughts

This chapter presented the tools utilised for an archaeological ethnography on the multifaceted sociality of Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy, through communities’ daily interactions and mobilisations. The theoretical research and fieldwork conducted for this thesis attempts to provide an additional layer to the complex cultural biography of these spaces.

It must be noted that as an Athenian, I was automatically a partial ‘insider’ when approaching members of residential movements due to my familiarity with the city. However, my status as an archaeology student was one that could have potentially hindered my access to residential activists due to their experiences with the archaeological service. I was fortunate to be accepted by the communities, which most likely detected my interest in these spaces—both from an archaeological perspective, but most importantly through my personal and sociopolitical views.

It is also important to keep in mind that this research has been conducted during a gruelling economic crisis, a turbulent political scene, and a dispirited social sphere; as neoliberal schemes have altered the urban landscape, citizens have responded by creating further collectives, movements and associations (among others) in order to deal with the countless imposed changes. In the years since initiating this thesis, there have been fundamental shifts in the way urban movements operate. In order to keep up with these changes and fluctuations, it was imperative to maintain contact with active members of residential associations, initiatives and movements. This came in many forms as previously mentioned; beyond recorded interviews, group discussions and assemblies however, there were also frequent casual meets at coffee houses, participants’ homes, or drinks/food at local bars and restaurants.

Conducting ethnographic research can be a very complex and composite process, especially when dealing with matters that are sensitive, political, and to a great extent, personal. I was lucky enough to become acquainted with an architect/activist from the very beginning of my journey, who gradually introduced me to a number of activists and people involved in the commons and the reclamation of public spaces. Nevertheless, I was not always as lucky; I was unable to interview a
lot of the ‘protagonists’ which have been involved in matters relating to the archaeological park of Plato’s Academy. Despite meeting on several occasions at conferences, workshops, assemblies and events, a number of the residential activists I approached had limited time and were not able to provide recorded interviews. Similarly, some members of the archaeological service which I contacted informed me that they were unable to meet or did not respond to my messages.

The methodologies utilised for this research emphasises the need for re-evaluating official narratives and discovering additional alternative ways to experience archaeological heritage as well as our general surroundings. They were employed to highlight the sensorial distance modernist archaeological practices have created in the way in which we come into contact with archaeological spaces (Hamilakis, 2013: 44-48). The emphasis on a sensorial exploration of sites can broaden the way we imagine and perceive archaeological parks and sites. It is an effort to re-conceptualise and re-evaluate the way we engage with archaeological remnants and temporality of spaces through alternative means and practices. The sensorial distance that modernist archaeological practices have formulated through the years seem to become recycled and re-used, creating a barrier in the way that we experience space and time. For most of us, it is the way we have been taught to think, act and perceive time and space. Attempting to overcome these barriers can often lead to an uncomfortable personal sphere, a “sensorial clash”, produced when dominant sensorial regimes conflict with multiple sensorial modes of engagement (Hamilakis 2013: 5).
Chapter 6    Temporality of the Extra-Official

Figures 6.1 and 6.2 Photosynthesising at Plato’s Academy (2014).\textsuperscript{47}

It didn’t take much to convince Kostas and Electra to celebrate Protomagia\textsuperscript{48} at Plato’s Academy. We all had a day off from work and we surely needed no excuse to crack open a bottle of wine and soak in the spring sun. Kostas had never been to Plato’s Academy before, whereas Electra had joined me on several of my previous visits to the park. Neither was interested in my fun historical facts—being friends for over two decades has programmed them to habitually ignore me when I start my mini-tutorials.

The park was bustling with people in various places throughout; some were searching for flowers to make the traditional May Day wreath that would hang on their doors until they dry. Others, like us, had set a picnic with various goodies to enjoy. All around, children’s laughter was echoing through the glorious pine trees, young adults were playing football on the grass (using one of the ancient stones as part of their goalpost, a bag on the other side), and early 30-somethings like ourselves were discussing politics and the rise of fascism in the country. A young explorer made use of the site’s information panel while waiting for his partner in crime to share her bicycle with him (see Figure 6.3).

\textsuperscript{47} Both images have been retrieved from my personal Instagram account, hence the snazzy filtering. Figure 6.2 was captured by my friend Kostas, who is seen pouring the wine in the image to the left.

\textsuperscript{48} The celebration of International Worker’s Day.
This chapter presents the modern social uses of the archaeological parks studied. It is by no means a complete guide to the endless temporal strands existing in these spaces; that would be humanly impossible. However, it attempts to reveal a ‘fraction in time’ in which these temporalities and materialities overlap through the locals’ social “dwellings” (Ingold 1993), contributing thus to the unique temporalisation of these particular landscapes. As such, it provides an insight into the re-appropriations of these spaces by local communities which go beyond their official discourses, state-coordinated forms of contact, and uses in antiquity. These activities enable for an extra-official narrative of these parks formed through the daily interaction with these as well as their use for special events and occasions which veer from general official appropriations and uses of archaeological sites. This chapter aims to capture the modern cultural biography of these spaces through the perceptions and experiences of local residents and the values they attribute to these. The last section reflects on some of my personal endeavours participating in artistic performances involving archaeological sites which—contrasted to Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy—are restricted in access, but constitute the locus of residential activism in their respective neighbourhoods.
6.1 “What Antiquities?”

It seems almost every time I introduce my research on Philopappou Hill to fellow Athenians, most make reference to the celebration of *Koulouma* at the park—the Eastern Christian commencing of Lent, also known as ‘Clean Monday’. They have either heard about the merriments of the religious holiday taking place on the hill or have participated in the past themselves. Koulouma is commonly celebrated with particular types of food, traditional dancing, as well as kite-flying, making the hill an optimum location for such an endeavour (Figure 6.4). Families and friends set up their picnics throughout the hills, searching for the ideal space to indulge both in food and the art of kite-flying. The Municipality of Athens provides visitors with live music and free traditional food, attracting visitors from surrounding neighbourhoods and beyond to join the celebrations. For many people, Philopappou is directly associated with—or even synonymous to—Koulouma, as they have only heard or visited the hill to welcome the commencement of Lent.

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 6.4** Celebrating *Koulouma* on the western part of the hills, despite the unfavourable weather conditions (2013).

---

49 Commonly known as Ash Monday.
In addition to the annual festivities that take place on Clean Monday, local residents, as well as friends of the hill from other neighbourhoods, engage in different types of daily activities upon the hills. One of the most prominent uses of Philopappou is for exercise and sports. The hill, along with the adjacent hills of the Pnyx and Hill of the Nymphs are used as a prime jogging location due to their multi-levelled terrain, offering runners of all abilities a range of options in terms of difficulty (see Figure 6.5). The multiple pathways include those created by Pikionis and others formulated in time by visitors, all leading to different parts of the hills. Similarly, the hills also attract bikers who find the natural setting appealing for bike-riding (however, a few of my participants observe that bike-riding damages the architectural pathways created by Pikionis). Some runners, as well as bike-riders, make use of the relatively sparse and simple sports equipment for exercising, stretching out before runs or riding or cooling off afterward. Quite frequently, they improvise and use benches, picnic tables or even ancient remnants in order to warm up or stretch their muscles. Runners vary in age and gender, often accompanied by friends or their dogs.

The cliffs of Philopappou Hill further provide the optimum edifice for rock-climbers to engage in their hobby, without having to pay money to travel outside the city or a gym with a climbing wall. It also gives them the opportunity to enjoy a view of the city from one of its highest points and in one its greenest spots. Having spoken to some friends that indulge in rock-climbing, they all agree that the hill is an ideal place for the sport. They appreciate that the park is in such close proximity to their homes, but also attest to the fact that the natural formation of the cliffs—from the texture to the rugged surface—makes climbing easier and more enjoyable. More recently however (March 2017), I received an email from the Open Residents’ Assembly of Petralona, Thiseio and Koukaki claiming that the cliffs of the hill had become inaccessible to rock-climbers as the Greek Archaeological Service restricted the area due to “the restoration of the archaeological site” (Figure 6.6).
Figure 6.5 Fitness on Philopappou Hill (2016).

Figure 6.6 Nothing to climb here: rock climbing forbidden for aspiring Spidermen/Spiderwomen (Photo Credit: Open Residents’ Assembly of Petralona, Thiseio and Koukaki, 2017).
Apart from the various sports practiced on Philopappou Hill, dog-walking is perhaps the most common daily activity. No matter what time it is during the day, there are always local residents from the neighbourhoods surrounding the park taking their dogs out for a walk. Several dog-parents take their dogs to the park solely to relieve their four-legged friends. However, dog-walking on the hill is a social activity, as it involves a number of people meeting up, walking together and socialising, discussing matters of the hill, political issues or even sharing personal stories. On my numerous walks around the hill with Dimosthenis and his dog, I met several people that take their dogs out for a walk. Everyone knows each other’s dogs and always stop to say hello and catch up—sometimes in the company of permanent quadrupedal residents of the park.

Figure 6.7 Philopappou Hill: a prime location for all species to form friendships (2017).
Dimosthenis’s love for his dog and the hill led us to meet almost monthly to discuss ancient philosophy and matters of the hill. In one of our first meetings, we bonded over our childhood experiences as scouts and quickly came to the mutual conclusion that scout life has shaped who we are as individuals. To this day, we both cherish our fellow scout friends as a second family. For Dimosthenis, the hill has been a vital part of his life ever since he was a young boy. He fondly remembers growing up in the neighbourhood and visiting the hill on a daily basis:

“I was born here, I grew up here, this is where I came to run and play [as a child]. I would run all over the hill slowly making new conquests. I passed the slope, then a little lower – [I discovered] new parts of the hill... Growing up, I visited new places, a saw parts of the hill I hadn’t seen [before]. But for that age, these were ‘conquests’... This is where I learned how to ride a bicycle. I fell over learning quite a few times!”

(Dimosthenis, personal communication, 19/9/2015)

Today, Dimosthenis enjoys walking his dog through the park and meeting with old friends to socialise, but it is clear to me from our discussions and from the way he engages with and experiences the hill, that his existence to a great extent has become entangled with the space. He views himself almost as a part or an extension of it, discovering parts of the hill and of himself at the same time. His multisensory perception of his surroundings, his personal connection to the space and his place within it—along with his affective and experiential connection to these—creates a nexus between his social life relating to space and to others through his habitual and everyday experiences as proposed by Ingold (1993: 162). In addition to conversations that focus on the protection of the hill, he engages in metaphysical and existential debates, always searching for people that share his love for philosophy. It was through our walks that I myself made my very own ‘conquests’. An excellent tour guide, Dimosthenis introduced me to a number of secrets along the hills, new pathways and new friends (both bi-pedal and four-legged.) Moreover, he revealed to me one of Pikionis’s lesser-known secrets: shouting out a word when standing directly in front of the marble amphitheatrical seating on the Andiros platform whilst facing the Acropolis, you can hear an echo of your own voice rising from the ground, vibrating through your entire body. It almost felt as if I was physically connecting to the materiality place, the vibrations slowly rising from the ground and reverberating through my muscles and core. In a sense, I was experiencing and embracing the coevalness as expressed by Fabian (1983) shared between the space, Dimosthenis and myself—the co-existence and synchronicity of the temporal and spatial qualities of my communication with my “object of study”; a moment of shared, intersubjective time (ibid: 42) through a hermeneutic engagement amongst all three elements. My chosen word was ‘freedom!’ and indeed, it was a liberating experience. I was both riveted by the sensation and excited about having this ‘secret’ disclosed to me (see Appendix I for my attempt to capture the view of the Acropolis from the Andiros platform in my not-so-advanced drawing skills).
With Dimosthenis as my guide, I discovered the importance of dog-walking and its integral contribution in creating a network, a sense of neighbourhood. People meet and create relations, sometimes on a short-term basis and others flourishing to lasting friendships. Interestingly, Dimosthenis and Sophia, a local activist and member of the movement’s coordinating team, have both noted that the act of dog-walking on the hill also functions as a form of ‘protection’ for the park. In several discussions regarding how to protect the hills from potential fires in the summer or from potential physical attacks, pet parents act as a kind of ‘neighbourhood watch’. On a number of occasions, it was residents that were walking their dogs who discovered works by state services or other forms of danger that had alerted the residents’ movement or the police. Residents’ dogs also make acquaintances with the dogs that reside on the hill; the furry residents of Philopappou are very friendly and are usually tended to both by the local community as well as the municipal guards. On one of my early morning walks to the hill in the spring of 2017, I was greeted by one of the many furry residents of the hill (Figure 6.8). His prominent presence at the entrance of the hill from Dionysiou Areopagitou Street did not go unnoticed; I tried convincing him to join me on my way up to the Andiros platform, but he solemnly acknowledged my presence, politely refused, and carried on guarding the hill.

Figure 6.8 No woofing matter: one of the unofficial guardians of the archaeological park (2017).
One of the main participants of my research, Andreas, is a local resident and activist. He usually arrives with his bicycle when we meet, always prepared with a home-made tea/coffee in his thermos and practical tools needed for any bicycle emergency. He is in many ways an adult version of a scout. He is a charismatic public speaker during assemblies and his eloquence is also present in the way he describes the park and his experiences in our discussions. In our first recorded interview, he captures the liveliness of the space through his personal experiences and remembers his early encounters with the hill:

“I first came to the park when I was in kindergarten, because I went to the Boura School, near the Acropolis […] My mom used to bring me here after class […] and then I used to come as a teenager, when I’d skip school. The hill hasn’t changed much since then, it was almost like it is today […] it had a kind of ‘wild’ essence—it didn’t have as many interventions as it does today, it was a natural setting that attracted people. And of course, the Pikionis interventions, which I didn’t know what they were at the time as I didn’t know who Pikionis was, but I remember liking them, aesthetically […] Since then, I have always been visiting the hill.”

(Andreas, personal communication, 10/11/2015)

For Andreas, the park has been a part of his everyday life ever since he could remember himself. He discusses the architectural interventions by Pikionis and the impression these left on him from his first visits and emphasises the natural element of the space and people’s attraction to it. For most of our discussion, these are the two components he primarily focuses on; in his words, he recalls that the archaeological remnants were organically a part of the general environment of the space, intertwined both with the architectural interventions and the natural setting. This was a common feature in a lot of the interviews that I conducted with local residents. This idea permeated all of our discussions, including the aspects of the hill that needed urgent attention or preservation. Of course, they all agreed that all aspects of the space need tending to (architectural, natural, and archaeological) but for the majority of our discussions, the main emphasis were the first two elements, rather than the archaeological remnants.

In her study of the contrasting dialectic of space centred on the Acropolis through the Pikionis’s interventions and those conducted by the American School of Classical Studies in their archaeological landscaping of the ancient Agora, Loukaki (1997) offers an interesting view which attests to Pikionis’s works as a unique feature contributing to the space’s multitemporality. She proposes that his integration of ancient traces into new compositions and the harmonious inclusion of environmental features of the space with a system of footpaths (ibid. 322) creates “a timeless and self-evident part of the setting”. She views his work as an engaging garden “because of the way he understands urban reality as something extremely complex” allowing for prospective “new urban myths” to intertwine with “mythical spaces” (ibid.: 325). Ultimately, Pikionis’s interventions
create a dynamic interaction between nature and culture, catering to “modern urban and social needs” as opposed to the ASCS which “turned its back on the living Athens in favour of the dead historical moment of Periclean Athens” (ibid.).

Sophia is one of the most passionate people I have met. Much like Andreas, she too is a very articulate speaker and combined with the passion she holds for the hill, it is very difficult not to pay close attention to everything she tells you. Her home, just like Sophia herself, is immersed in knowledge; the endless books welcoming visitors in the living room along with the immaculate archives she has collected in reference to the hill shows her determination to matters concerning the space. She tells me about her neighbourhood, the district of Koukaki, and recounts her family’s arrival to the area and the arrangement of the houses surrounding the hills. When I asked her how she perceived the antiquities on Philopappou as a young girl, she looked directly at me and said:

“What antiquities? Nobody was noticing the antiquities, what antiquities? It was everything. It was a unified, cohesive entity [...] yes, the ancient [Philopappou] monument, but it wasn’t in anybody’s mind that this was ancient.... How should I explain it? The items we have at our home—they are a part of a whole—nobody thought of Philopappou as an archaeological site [...] the first ones to establish the idea of the hill as an archaeological site, were the [archaeologists]. The neighborhood had never thought of the park as an archaeological site [...] it is the place I went on school field trips, with my boyfriends; I’m not original—we all did the same things. No one ever thought that the Philopappou Monument was any different, separate from the works of Pikionis or the actual rocks and environment of the hill. All these elements were one... everything was eventually amplified, and separated, classified into different historical periods, etc. —even in my own mind—by the intervention of the archaeologists. This park was a unified space, and that was the magic of it.”

(Sophia, personal communication, 13/11/15)

With this remark, she explains that the residents do not differentiate the antiquities from the rest of the landscape; they view them as being in fact part of it, and by extension a part of their everyday lives. This brings to mind Bergson’s (1991) proposal of an alternative perception of time and the prolonging nature of memory; Sophia has created a link between matter and temporality through duration, one that allows for the coexistence between moments and memories through their connection to materiality. This affective relation to the space was in many ways ruptured by the plans to monumentalise Philopappou—the classification of the site into different periods attempt to become monumentalised created a ripple in her own personal conception of the hill. To some extent, Sophia’s words echo the sentiments evoked by Dimosthenis and Andreas; more significantly, to my understanding, she confirms the clear dichotomy between the time residents
enjoyed the park as a unified entity and the intervention by archaeologists which contextualised and sanctified features of the hill. The harmonious and habitual symbiosis of everyday things—much like the furniture in our home—were suddenly rearranged, reconfigured, labelled and restricted.

As for Sophia’s personal use of the space, it is obvious that her connection to the park has been embedded into her everyday reality from a young age, perhaps associating it with a sense of liberation and carefreeness; even during the years when she lived in a different neighbourhood, she found a way to reconnect with the space:

“I used to come to the park every afternoon as a teenager to see the sunset [...] It was the one hour of ‘freedom’ I had won, and I chose to spend it at the park. Even when I moved elsewhere years later, I would often take the train just to visit the park and see the sunset. Today, I use it for exercising and socialising with friends”.

(Sophia, personal communication, 13/11/15)

Laura was one of the few residential activists that I interviewed as part of my fieldwork who had not been raised in the area neighbouring the hill. Her warm smile and well-mannered nature always makes it easy to talk to her. It also makes it incredibly surprising when she becomes passionate about state services imposing changes upon the hill. Whenever we meet, we spend some time sharing our common experiences growing up; we both attended international schools and scouts clubs. Laura is always looking for new adventures; her energy and optimism are admirable. During our peripatetic interview through the hills, Laura informs me that her relationship with the hill developed mainly through the residents’ movement, upon discovering a poster near her home outlining the problems associated with the park. Since attending her first assembly meeting, Laura made a number of friends who gradually brought her to the hill more frequently, enjoying walks through the pathways and meeting with friends to socialise or discuss matters affecting the space. She took me to a spot near the site of the Pnyx that a friend had shown her and told me that her friend would:

“buy a souvlaki from Monastiraki and he’d come and sit here for an entire afternoon, read his book, and would be surprised that no one else came [to the same spot]”.

(Laura, personal communication, 24/6/2017)

As Laura claimed, he had discovered the one place where traces of the modern city were not visible, and a direct view of the Acropolis standing across from the Hill provided for the idyllic relaxation scenery. “If you stand here and take a photograph, people will assume that it was taken in the past”. It almost seems as though this spot—the time-traveller’s spot—is a place where both
Laura and her friend can escape the temporal reality of the present and idealise an imagined temporal space far from the one existing beyond their views.

**Figure 6.9** ‘The time-traveller’s spot’—from this location, the traces of the modern city are lost behind the towering Athenian hills (Pnyx, 2017).

As for my own extra-official experience of the hill, one of my favourite aspects of the space is the smell of pine trees during different seasons, which—especially in late spring—always evokes memories from the last days of school or from memorable summer camps. The first brings back feelings of hope and freedom as the sweet release from school was near, the latter a sense of familiarity and what I can only describe as ‘safety’—being transported back to a time when I was carefree, enjoying the summer with friends that gradually became my second family. Tuning in to sounds enabled me to enhance my multisensory experience of the park. I like to think of these as ‘soundtracks’ to the setting; the subtle crunching of turtles in the bushes, the strange bird calls of species I would have never thought existing in Athens, the bachata\(^50\) music traveling through the wind from an unidentifiable location, almost as if the park could be any park, in any part of the world.

\(^{50}\) A form of music and dance originating from the Dominican Republic.
6.2 “We’ll talk, we’ll hang out, we’ll exchange opinions…”

Plato’s Academy welcomes locals and ‘friends of the park’ from other neighbourhoods of the city on a daily basis. Four-legged friends—both residents of the park or accompanied by their pet parents—are always in sight, along with children in different segments of the space, usually playing football or hide-and-go-seek. Runners dash by whilst further in the distance a kung-fu class is just starting. Teenagers sit amongst the scattered ancient remnants, giggling and prank each other, whispering secrets to their friends and watching funny videos on their smartphones. On one of my very first visits to the park, a new friend gave me an important piece of advice: “Always come and visit the park when you have sorrows. Its beauty, along with the love of its residents, will help you forget your worries and problems.” And I must admit, he was right. It is easy to forget your personal problems—albeit, temporarily—at a park as lively as Plato’s Academy.

Figure 6.10 Just like a rolling stone: teenagers making full use of the park’s antiquities. Photo used with permission by Yannis Drakoulidis, 2015.
Much like Philopappou Hill, Plato’s Academy is a heterogeneous environment, consisting of archaeological remnants scattered throughout the park, benches and belvederes for socialising and more recently a digital museum on the history of Plato’s school of thought (Figure 6.11). The multiplicity of the park provides for varying degrees of socialisation; from simply hanging out or having a coffee—much like Electra in Figure 6.12, to picnicking or dog-walking, national holiday celebrations and events such as music/film or political festivals organised by various groups and associations. The local community living in the surrounding neighbourhoods have embraced the park in multiple and creative ways.

Figure 6.11 A quadrupedal resident waiting for Plato’s Academy Digital Museum to open (2015).
When I first started visiting the park, I was told by several people that I should speak to Mihalis regarding the history of the space. Mihalis is an active resident and self-proclaimed ‘amateur’ historian. Our conversations focus on the history of the space, and the first time we met, Mihalis brought archives and photographs to present a detailed account of the park’s historical background. His main interest in the park—apart from its preservation and protection—is its promotion as a historical school of thought and philosophy. He is a founding member of Hecademeia, a research group consisting of residents and friends of the area. Hecademeia aims to present the history of Plato’s Academy primarily through guided tours of the park (Hecademia Blogspot 2019). Moreover, the group combines the tours with ancient and contemporary poetry readings, theatrical and musical productions. I had the chance to visit the park during one of the musical events organised by Mihalis and a band called Syndaitymónes51 (Figure 6.15). The band performs what they perceive to be ancient Greek music, using instruments that are present in ancient texts and imagery. Their performance in the site’s palaestra can be described as an intermix between temporal modes: a modern band playing what they believe ancient music sounded like, in the archaeological space. Today, the use of the particular space has been interpreted by archaeologists

---

51 The word Syndaitymónas in ancient Greek refers to an individual who dines in the company of others at the same table.
as a palaestra in antiquity—a space used for young athletes to exercise. The extra-official use of the space by Mihalis and Syndaitymônes offers an intermingling of temporality and materiality which attests to the multiplicity of time and space and the diverse forms of appropriation by people in time.

Mihalis informs me that although he has not been raised in the neighbourhood, he feels it is his duty to promote the historical significance of the space to the community as well as visitors coming from other parts of the city and the world. He takes great pride in the archives he has collected and his position as the neighbourhood historian. His appreciation of the archaeological significance of the park was evident not only through our discussions, but in the spontaneous tours of the site he gave me both times we met—we were even joined by friends of the park in the second one! (See Figure 6.16).

Figure 6.13 Mihalis presents the history of the archaeological site at the Palaestra of Plato’s Academy. He is accompanied by the band Syndaitymônes (2016).
“I have a daughter that I used to take to the playground when she was a child. During the summer months, many Japanese and German tourists came with their cameras and they would ask me: ‘Where is the Platonic Academy, where is Plato’s Academy?’ And I did not know. I would inform them ‘there are some ancient remnants toward that direction’, ‘what are they?’ [...] There was no inscription, there was nothing. I started to ask the locals who were born and bred here. ‘What are these antiquities?’ But they didn’t know anything. Only some taverns and cafés had borrowed the name ‘Platon’ [...] ‘But what’s inside [the restricted archaeological structures], what was there in the past?’ No one knew. That’s when I told myself I wanted to learn what was here. Yes, Plato’s Academy [was here], but what was Plato’s Academy? How did it develop? So I spent all my free time going from one library to the next [...] People want to learn! Not everybody, but a lot of them do. Some people come and tell me they used to visit the space on class trips but they did not know that there was the ancient gymnasium here, they just saw things that looked ancient, without any indication or anything. And after so
many years they say, ‘Guys, I had to turn 50 years old to meet Mihalis so that he can tell me that there was an ancient school here!’”

(Mihalis, personal communication, 29/10/15)

There is an evident sense of pride in identifying as the neighbourhood’s historian. Mihalis feels an innate sense of stewardship for the Academy which I believe could perhaps be reinforced by his prior lack of knowledge of the space. Today, it is almost as if he has overcompensated for his previous unawareness of the Academy’s rich history. He feels a sense of responsibility for the site, a feeling that prompted him to embark on a personal journey to discover more about its historical significance.

Alexandros is an active member of the Cooperative Café. I was introduced to him by Ilianna, a friend who lives near the park. Alexandros was hanging out at the park with his dogs and after our formal introduction with his quadrupedal friends, we discovered that we had a lot of mutual experiences to share through our participation in various groups and hangouts. Ilianna promptly suggested that Alexandros would be a great participant in my research, especially since the house he grew up in bordered the park. One of the first things we discussed when we arranged to meet for coffee and a recorded interview were his memories of the park growing up. He fondly recalls playing amongst the ancient remnants that were situated in the space when he was a kid:

“I remember that this space was not a park at all. There used to be houses here [indicates within the park], and over there [indicates] there used to be stones with graves and there was also a very big statue which we played with [when we were kids]. There was a particular grave with engravings all around; we would jump from one grave to the next. It was out in the open, I mean, completely. The statue was really big. We used to lie on top of it […] I don’t know what happened to these [antiquities]. Some of them have gone to the storage [the Service’s archaeological storage] but no one really knows—anyone could have taken the statue from here”.

(Alexandros, personal communication, 3/8/17)

The way he discusses his interaction with antiquities as a child shows a level of intimacy demonstrating his close relation to tangible remnants of the past. It denotes a sense of “entanglement” between things and humans as described by Hodder (2012: 85), as “things have lives of their own and intersect with humans at specific points”. Similarly, Alexandros became ‘entangled’ with ancient material remains from a young age, which subsequently influenced his approach to the materiality and temporality of the space. The ancient graves and stones became a part of his everyday life and his personal narrative, interlinking his experiences with multiple temporalities through his tangible relationship with antiquities. His house is one of the last ones standing in such close proximity to the archaeological space, expropriated by the Service and
pending in status. His vivid memories playing amongst the ruins is at odds with his conflicting feelings about his childhood home being seized by the government in order to expand the archaeological site:

“We wanted to paint the house and the Service came and told us that we cannot [paint]. After that incident, we tried digging a hole in our garden [...] we wanted to do something for the shop [family business adjacent to home], we wanted to plant a tree, or a palm tree—I do not remember. But they [the Service] came back and told us that we couldn’t [dig] [...] They told us about a year ago that the house would be expropriated and that we had to go through the legal procedures for it to be finalised. We have done everything that needs to be done and now we are waiting to see what our compensation will be [...] The house is my family home, it is from 1955. That’s how long we [family] have been here. It was built in 1955 [...] What is the point of waiting and not knowing what’s going to happen? It would be best if this was over and done with so that I can find another house somewhere nearby that is similar to mine. I would definitely want to find a detached house [μονοκατοικία or monokatikí]—it would be very difficult for me to live in an apartment building, and I have my dogs [...] The problem is that, if I want to do something—like right now, I want to change the window shutters because they’re made from wood. It’s very humid during the wintertime and even though I want to change them, I can’t, because I’m still waiting for the approval [of compensation]. When they [Service] came to appraise the cost of the house, they even wrote down what trees and palm trees we have so that we can be compensated. And I don’t know how long it will be.”

(Alexandros, personal communication, 3/8/17)

Alexandros’s personal experience with his home has created a ripple in his daily life. The pending expropriation has affected his routine, the way he tends to the house, and the plans he might have had for the future. This disruption in his personal sense of temporality and materiality has played a significant role in the way he thinks about his home—he discusses the present issues and those that might be in the future, and makes reference to the time his family home was built in the past. This experience—having to move out from his family home for the sake of preserving the past—has created a rupture in his everyday reality, much like Knight and Stewart (2016) argue, as well as Herzfeld (1991: 11) in his discussion of the imposing monumentalisation of private homes in the city of Rethemnos. Alexandros mentioned his family home several times throughout our discussion and it was evident that it was a matter that had caused him considerable distress.

In recent years, Alexandros has been actively involved in helping out the stray dogs that live at the park, along with other dog parents and friends of the park. “We tried to find ways to support the
stray dogs, to make a shelter that would provide them a place to eat and sleep, especially during the winter” (Alexandros, personal communication, 3/8/2017). Unfortunately, he informs me that the Residents’ Committee were not willing to help with their plan, but he maintains that the dogs have brought people closer together and more frequently to the park.

“I have noticed that people become more social, because they come out with their dogs, as well as a group of individuals that tends to the stray dogs. Many people have become more sensitive, they adopt a dog, groups of friends are formed, you adopt a dog and someone else does, and inevitably we both bring them out to the park—we’ll talk, we’ll hang out, we’ll exchange opinions.”

(Alexandros, personal communication, 3/8/17)

It must be noted here that we were visited by furry residents of the park frequently throughout our discussion. Much like Philopappou Hill, dogs have brought neighbours together. They have created a network that keeps expanding, allowing people to socialise on a daily basis within the park. This communication amongst neighbours has prompted the creation of various discussions and initiatives, both in regards to the protection of the dogs residing at the park, but also the protection of the park itself.

It was through dog-walking with Ilianna—one of my sister’s good friends from school—that I discovered the park in its totality. Her companion, Rooney, was a beagle with mischievous tendencies who would often run off and hang out with four-legged residents of the park or use his olfactory sense to make sure who’s been around in the last few hours, even days. On one of our walks I came across a small, makeshift garden created by the neighbourhood’s 24th Scouts Club. The children had planted various seeds including marigolds, as can be seen in the left signpost in Figure 6.17. Ilianna informed me that the neighbourhood scouts club was very active in matters concerning the park, and often invited residents to help them clean the space or re-paint benches and other structures. Through their community service, the neighbourhood scouts club makes a small and significant reclamation of the park themselves: their efforts to beautify the park, accentuate its environmental character and to rid it of garbage shows their motivation to incorporate the space in their daily lives and activities. Of course, community service is part of scout life, but within the context of this particular neighbourhood, these actions are deemed necessary.
Ilianna moved to the neighbourhood of Plato’s Academy in 2007. She has a lot of memories from the area since she was very young, as she used to visit her father who lived near the park. She tells me that he used to take her to the Sacred House and informed her that the protective canopy and the fences around the structure were built in the 50’s (and haven’t been removed since). She fondly remembers him sharing stories about his childhood in the park and recalls her first memories of it with her father:

“I didn’t know the neighbourhood at all, I had never really walked around here. My dad used to take me on walks, he used to bring me to the park—because he really enjoyed taking walks—and he always insisted: ‘come, let me show you the antiquities, come!’; and I kept thinking, ‘where is he taking me?’ Elena, it was horrible. Absolutely awful.’

ES: Was the park very different to what it is today?

“It was nothing like this, it was awful. Ok, I was quite young at the time, and because I had grown up in Zografou, I was used to the park near my house—so everything here seemed very different [compared to Zografou][...] When I came here in 2007, I adopted my dog, and the moment I adopted him, I started exploring the park with him.”

(Ilianna, personal communication, 25/7/2017)
Ilianna has associated her first memories of the park with her father. Much like Mihalis, her previous experience of the space was very different to her connection with it today. Despite being overwhelmed by the state of the park when she first arrived—especially due to its stark contrast to the park she grew up near—she too discovered the Academy in her own way.

She argues that there was a massive change in the park before the materialisation of the Athens 2004 Olympic Games and after, when she permanently moved to the area.

“When I came in 1992 the park had fencing. There was no lighting—and there still isn’t at night—it has random lighting. It had garbage, it smelled, it had houses, it had storage structures. Alexandros lives over there [indicates]. His house has been expropriated and he's still waiting [to be compensated]. He keeps telling me ‘I can't do anything [to the house] because whatever money I spend will not be reimbursed’. They haven't received compensation yet—ROONEY, OVER HERE—there were more houses—and I remember they were falling apart, people told me there was a storage with car tires in the space, and over here [indicates within the park's space] there was a house. It was here until about two years ago [2015]. There was a house here [indicates]—this entire triangle, if you follow it straight ahead, that was used as a storage for antiquities by the archaeological service. It was a beautiful house [...] [the storage] had barbed wire, lighting, a security alarm so that no one can enter. They eventually demolished the house and transferred the antiquities from what I've understood to Monastiriou Street.”

(Ilianna, personal communication, 25/7/2017)

I was becoming increasingly aware that the memories of the Academy shared by residents added a new layer of materiality and temporality associated with the space. Unlike Philopappou Hill, the Academy seems to have complex and palpable layers, more modern traces of human activity and everyday life which constantly kept transforming and changing throughout the years.

During our first, unrecorded interview in 2014, Ilianna humorously described how outlandish she thought it was that one of her cousins that resides on a parallel street right above the park has no knowledge of or interest in visiting the space. She insists that Greek people are not accustomed to the idea of hanging out at parks and that it was mostly visitors from other cultures that engaged with the Academy more frequently and walked around the antiquities. To a certain extent, she believes that this was also perhaps because the park did not have sufficient lighting at night (and still doesn’t), and many people are afraid of walking through, especially since there were a number of drug users and crimes reported in the past. Our second interview took place in late summer of 2017. She has noticed a change in the interaction between the local community and the park, most likely due to the crisis.
“You wouldn’t find Greeks hanging out at parks before. The Greeks started [hanging out at the park] after the [economic] crisis [...] It wasn’t in our [the Greeks’] mentality because we didn't have parks. So, in a way, it made sense. But the locals living in the neighborhood did not visit the park regularly [before the crisis]. I have two friends that have grown up in the area and they keep telling me not to come here, because it's not clean. Because that's how they remember the park. Or, they tell me 'it's dangerous to hang out there at night'. Well, I do hang out here at night [...] But there are always people taking out their dogs for a walk, so...”

(Ilianna, personal communication, 25/7/2017)

The reluctance of Greeks to hang out in the park could be associated to a xenophobic, middle class part of the community which was hesitant to share the space with the Romani population and migrants which settled in the area for the 80s onwards (Petras 2013). Moreover, I couldn’t help but think in addition to prompting people to visit the parks more often, the financial crisis had another, more dire consequences neighbourhoods like Plato’s Academy. It is widely known that the neighbourhood, along with surrounding areas, was affected immensely by the crisis in 2009. As such, the layering of memories and re-appropriations that I referred to previously are not just a result of memories and a progression of time, but they are also a result of the negative consequences/impacts on small businesses being forced to close down. In this particular case, the passing of time is not just a temporal notion, but on that is materially evident and tangible in a most devastating way.

Alexandros concurs, claiming that the crisis has:

“People did not come out [to the park], they did other things, they didn’t come to the park to catch up, they weren’t up to it. They’d say: ‘We have money, let’s go somewhere out’. But now there is no such thing, people have changed, they come here [to the park]. [Before the crisis] people didn’t come here to sit down and eat, to hang out in the park. Now, the park is full [of people] every day (horn sounds in the background) Hey Liako!”

(Alexandros, personal communication, 3/8/17)

The 2004 Olympic Games and the economic crisis constitute important timemarks for the state of archaeological parks as well as the modes of engagement with these. In the case of Plato’s Academy, the Olympics provided an incentive to ‘clean up’ the park and make it a part of a programme unifying important archaeological sites throughout the city. In addition, the financial crisis drew more people to the park, favouring a free walk in nature rather than paying for an outing.
My journey to discover the multileveled relationship between archaeological sites and local communities took me beyond the archaeological parks of Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy. It led me down a number of interesting pathways and places, discovering the multifaceted temporal layers existing in sites of archaeological heritage in the present. Being open to new experiences allowed me to understand the context-specific elements of each site and community and the significance of their unique dynamic. Several of these activities were primarily coordinated by architect, social urbanist, artist, and activist, Harikleia Haris, who after many years of collaboration, discussions and experiences together, has become a valued friend. The particular events described below were a part of the project Microgeographies—Participatory Territorial Narrative Mechanisms, the first two from the chapter: Revivification of Ancient Ruins, the Temple of Artemis Agrotera and the last from the Demosion Sema: Public Reading of Pericles’ Epitaph (Thucydides 11.34-46 in Thauer and Wendt 2016).52

52 The public reading/performance was performed with the collaboration of the Orizontas Team from Kerameikos, as well as artists and architects: Yannis Beskos, Jimmy Efthimiou, Harikleia Hari, Nikos Kazeros, Maria Peteinaki, Angelos Skourtis, Yannis Theodoropoulos, Eleni Tzirtzilaki and Yorgos Tzirtzilakis. For more information on the performance: http://microgeographies3.nonplan.gr/archives/1077. [Last Accessed: 21/11/2018.]
In one such case, I was offered the chance to enter artist Nikos Stathopoulos’ ‘elevating’ device/work of art and participate in the interactive performance called “Rising” (See Figure 6.18, above)\(^5\). Nikos’ artwork was temporarily situated on a platform adjoining the classical site of the Temple of Agrotera Artemis, which is not accessible or visible to outsiders on account of the aluminum panels set up by the Archaeological Service due to ongoing works. Suspended almost two meters from the ground, I experienced a sense of serenity and liberation, as if I was surfing through a surreal painting—floating amongst three-dimensional archaeological spaces that seemed to jump-up from their contemporary setting. Perhaps they ‘jumped out’ because that is where my attention was focused; I was desperately trying to imagine the city without its modern constructions, without the roads and pavements. I was particularly lucky that day; it was the day of the Annual Athens Marathon which meant that the streets were free of cars. I was able to hear the city’s silence, its natural sounds, friends nearby, laughing. I was able to smell the distinctive scent of pine trees perhaps coming from Ardittos Hill nearby; I felt like the cage was, in fact, a time capsule and that I was traveling back in time, transported to a moment when the visible archaeological spaces now in sight had a different meaning, a different texture… Ironically, I was able to have a highly charged sensorial experience a few feet away from an archaeological site that is completely off-limits to the public.

Another memorable experience beyond the fencing of the same archaeological site was the performance entitled MetsGiving (The Gift) by artist Katerina Velliou. This particular chapter of the Microgeographies project intended to combine site-specific art works and public discussions considering the potential to incorporate ‘abandoned’ archaeological sites within the city’s everyday life (Microgeographies 2014c). The project collaborated with the Residents of Mets Initiative as well as the Ardittos Association, founded in the same neighbourhood. The particular performance by artist Katerina Velliou involved a series of steps; first, she found a stone located outside the archaeological site. She then broke the stone into a series of smaller pieces and sewed the fragments on an embroidered tablecloth that belonged to her grandmother. Upon completion, she placed the embroidered cloth at the entrance of the temple (the aluminum panel protecting the space) and proceeded in cutting around the sewn fragmented stones, creating ‘amulets’ which were donated to the guests. According to urbanist and host, Harikleia Hari, this was “a symbolic act of reconciliation which acts as intermediary between ‘place-human’ expectation and true signification of a site” (ibid.). Watching the artist in a silence while she cut pieces of her grandmother’s embroidered tablecloth with the pieces of stone from the space activated a very complex thought process from my personal standpoint. I was overwhelmed with sentiment thinking

about my own grandmother and her cherished embroidered cloths we treasure at our home; the sound from the rushing cars nearby would bring me back to the artist’s performance and her connection to the particular space, her grandmother, her art, and now, us. She was sharing a personal memory with the temporal and material memory of a space none of us had effectively created a tangible experience with; we were in the presence of the Acropolis standing imposingly in the background, instinctively and unconsciously making connections between the two archaeological sites. Most importantly, the artist’s multi-temporal artwork charged with her personal memories and combined with the space’s materiality was passed on to us, the individuals in the audience, creating indefinite strands of temporal and material possibilities.

![Image of Artist Katerina Velliou performing MetsGiving (TheGift). Temple of Agrotera Artemis, Mets 2014 (Photo Credit: Microgeographies. Photos used with permission).]

Our night venture to the Demosion Sema, the public cemetery of the city during the classical period, was an equally memorable experience. Through the writings of Thucydides’ *History of the Peloponnesian War*, it is noted (Tritle 2010: 17) that Pericles delivered his famous speech at this site, honouring the Athenians that had died in war whilst simultaneously motivating and encouraging the people by glorifying the citizens’ achievements and their determination during times of hardship. The reading was initially performed by Harikleia, but as time progressed, the participants began joining the reading and improvising in innovative ways. Whilst one individual was reading a passage, another would join reading the same text with a small delay or another excerpt from the Oration. This created an echo, which at times emphasised the meaning of the text and at others created a creative intertwine, leading to further exploratory ways to join the group reading. The reading started out as a re-enactment of Pericles’ speech, slowly turning into an improvised, spoken word performance. We were accompanied by random onlookers who were interested in finding out what we were doing. Some asked for the text and joined us, while others remained in the background, observing the reading from a short distance.
After the performance, there was a discussion regarding our activity at the nearby hangout which hosts the Orizontas Gegonoton initiative. Our discussion was divided into two parts: the first involved the correlations between the text and the present, whilst the latter referred to our personal experience of the activity. Our observations of Pericles’ oration evolved around the definition of democracy and its multifaceted layers, most prominently connecting to current concepts and definitions of democracy in the present. The discussion weighed in on the lack of direct democratic processes on a governmental level, and the abundance of grassroots existing in the city today which have successfully managed to bring change in numerous neighbourhoods throughout the city on a micro-level. The conversation made connections between the current social and political situation, economic turbulence and civil unrest during the years of the crisis, in connection to the crisis of war in antiquity and its associated implications during the time the speech was first delivered. The particular site is partly open to the public, providing a small park-like structure with wooden benches and resting areas for the public. The core part of the site is enclosed as excavations are still taking place, revealing the common graves of the Athenian soldiers that died during the Peloponnesian War.

![Image](image_url)

**Figure 6.20** Demotion Sema, Public Reading of Pericles’ Epitaph, *Microgeographies*, 2014.

---

54 The Orizontas Gegonoton Initiative is a group of artists and educators which aim to promote artistic endeavours and to further integrate art in the community’s everyday lives. It was initiated as a not for profit company in Ileia, Greece in 2006 and has been involved in several cultural events throughout Greece and the world. Their base is in the district of Kerameikos, a multi-purpose space for the exhibition and presentation of art in all its forms. Source: [http://orizontasgegonoton.weebly.com/](http://orizontasgegonoton.weebly.com/) [Last Accessed: 23/02/2019].
The above three types of events and forms of contact with archaeological spaces in the city represent a fragment of the nature of engagement with archaeological sites and heritage. They demonstrate the need for “creative activity” (Lefebvre 1996 [1968]: 147), to have the opportunity to develop people’s social lives in the city beyond commercial infrastructures. They present the essential necessity to connect with space through multisensory engagements, one which allows the freedom to participate in the creation and appropriation of their environments. These activities may not necessarily depict the everyday forms of site appropriation, but delineate underlying efforts to create a more tangible and substantial connection to archaeological sites. They also represent a lost opportunity to create a connection between archaeology and the public, one that would allow the latter to become a part of the archaeological process or at least establish direct access to heritage. The present examples are only two of the numerous types of events that people organise in order to re-appropriate and acquire a deeper link with the past and its palpable remnants.

The activities at the Temple of Agrotera Artemis at Mets and the Demosion Sema in Kerameikos, consist only three of the numerous events I had the opportunity to be part of. They were chosen to demonstrate the nature of activities that take place in sites that are restricted in access by the public. Depending on the type of interaction and contact—art performance, public reading, exhibition, etc. — these events draw direct parallels between the historicity of the spaces and the present day. They reflect on the timelessness both of the sites as well as their historical uses. People seek to re-appropriate enclosed archaeological spaces within the broader urban context and social life of neighbourhoods. They are efforts to re-appropriate and rejuvenate spaces that have been frozen in time, creating voids in a city that needs more open, public spaces. In many ways, the participants are painfully aware of the distance between restricted archaeological sites and the social life of space beyond their enclosures.

6.4 Concluding Thoughts

This chapter demonstrated the variety of social activities that contribute to the temporality and the social lives of the archaeological spaces of interest. These activities delineate the diverse ways in which local communities have re-appropriated the sites, attributing additional modes and forms of engagements to a constantly evolving temporalised landscape. The chapter illustrated how seemingly ‘trivial’ or mundane activities—such as dog-walking or exercising—create multiple layers of interaction between locals and spaces, as well as deeper relations amongst people. This cycle of interaction perpetually progresses, creating new heritage discourses and ‘chapters’ in the cultural biography of sites. Both Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy provide the setting for a number of everyday “dwelling activities” as proposed by Ingold (1993). It is these every day, extra-official interactions and contact with the parks which further contribute to their status as taskscapes. It is through these activities that the parks are kept ‘alive’; differentiating them from other, isolated archaeological sites which are ‘frozen’ in time and inaccessible to the public. Their
multiplicity has enabled their “dynamic simultaneity” as Massey (2005) suggests, interlinking the coexistence of multiple temporalities, materialities and social relations.

The open archaeological parks present crucial examples of spaces that have eluded their heterotopian bounds. The diversity and frequency of engagements break these bounds, allowing them thus to become active spaces, integrated both in the urban and social fabric of the neighbourhood and by extension, of the city. Despite the various changes they might have endured, their open access has rejuvenated the appropriations of the spaces and have provided a platform for the development of social interactions and activities. It has reinforced the right of citizens to be a part of the production of space in the city as Lefebvre (1991: 38) notes, through spatial practices and “dialectical interactions” between society and space. This is of great importance during critical times like the present where there is a need for more open spaces. These particular parks and the increase of their social uses reflect that need and demonstrate how vital the integration of archaeological sites in the urban environment is.

In the case of Plato’s Academy, several forms of contact are directly linked to and inspired by the park’s historicity and the uses of the particular space in antiquity—as opposed to Philopappou—along with the multitude of daily interactions. Others have no connection to the historical significance of sites, much like rock-climbing on Philopappou or playing football at the Academy. Whether or not there is a straightforward link or activities inspired by past uses of the sites, people maintain awareness of the spaces they are engaging with; it reflects their close association and familiarisation with the landscape, its materiality and its temporality beyond its historicity. What is more is that the spaces have enabled social networks to develop and to actively contribute to the maintenance of a sense of neighbourhood in both areas.

On the other hand, the activities taking place beyond the fencing constitute comparative examples of spaces that have been clearly demarcated and inaccessible to the public. They function as heterotopias, isolated and protected from a ‘polluted’ present. The activities associated with these sites are less frequent and more ‘extraordinary’; they do not compose everyday activities such as exercising or dog-walking, but represent efforts in creating a palpable connection with a space of historical significance.

All of the activities captured above, along with a myriad others too many to encapsulate in one thesis, compose the multitemporality of the extra-official discourses of these spaces. They reveal the modern engagements beyond the disciplinary discourses which present sites as “partial landscapes” (Stroulia and Sutton 2010: 7), systematically removing them from the plurality of their own temporal and spatial capacities.

The following chapter will discuss yet another appropriation of the archaeological parks that further contributes to their status as multifaceted taskscapes but require a chapter of their own: the clashes and contestations which have taken place at, or associated with, the parks.
Chapter 7  Clashes/Contested Spaces

On the morning of the 22nd of January 2015, I woke up to an extremely urgent email from the Philopappou Movement: “They are putting fences up at the Pnyx! Come as soon as possible—spread the word!” Moments later, I received a phone call from Sophia. She was at the police station where she and other residents had arrived, in order to make an official statement to obstruct the Archaeological Service’s plan to set up fences around the Pnyx. She explained the situation to me in English, so as to not be understood by the police officers at the station. Listening to her anxiously describing the events that had unfolded earlier that morning, I felt my heart racing—a strange adrenaline rush. It could have been my very unfortunate encounter with the police the previous month, or the fact that it seemed as though we were about to experience the very same events that had brought the Philopappou Movement together in the first place, thirteen years ago.

Urban activism has changed significantly in the last twenty years—both on a global and on a local scale—from the issues that are being addressed to the ways that they are dealt with and handled. This research views three particular events as key timemarks/chronological references that have played a catalytic role in the way urban movements mobilise in Athens. First, the preparations for the 2004 Olympics initiated the city’s gradual urban and social reconfiguration on a larger scale than before. These shifts in the urban structure of the city affected and still affect the status of open, public spaces and their continuing privatisation. Second, the eruption of the economic crisis combined with the murder of Grigoropoulos led to the intensification of urban mobilisation from 2008 on, particularly stimulating younger individuals to join movements (Dalakoglou and Vradis 2011; Stavrides 2014). Last, the anti-austerity movement of 2011 in Greece created a shift in the way urban movements operate throughout Athens (Arampatzi 2017a; 2017b). Residential associations and movements benefited from the plethora of tactics utilised during the 2011 strikes and demonstrations, expanding thus their protesting techniques and developing additional networks amongst individuals, collectives, neighbourhoods and other movements in Athens. As such, they became more equipped to fight against social, political, economic, and environmental injustices imposed upon the city and its citizens. Ultimately, neoliberal governance and policies prompted greater solidarity amongst movements as well as diversity and creativity in their efforts to reclaim their right to the city.

Beyond the array of social activities that formulate the spaces’ extra-official temporal vivacity explored in the previous chapter, the conflicts associated with the protection and access to these sites further contribute to their multilayered cultural biography. These contestations have now become an integral part of the spaces’ contemporary history, recorded both in official and unofficial documents and records. This chapter therefore discusses the ongoing clashes that have
taken place—and continue to do so—at Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy between residential movements and state services. It aims to present the ways in which these clashes have operated within the broader urban mobilisations taking place in Athens in recent years. It seeks to discover whether residential activism has reinforced contact and interaction with archaeological spaces. It explores the extent to which official archaeological practices and state bureaucracy have impeded or facilitated a reflexive relationship between local communities and archaeological heritage. Taking into consideration the abundance of clashes between residential movements and state services throughout the years, this chapter will focus on the most prominent issues and those which continue to be a source of conflict.

7.1 A Night to Remember

It was in 2002, in light of the 2004 Olympics preparations, that the Ministry of Culture decided on the restriction of the open archaeological park and its imminent conversion to an organised archaeological site, which would entail limiting its access to the public at certain hours and prospectively imposing an admission fee for entrance. On the morning of November 3, the residents planned their first assembly in order to discuss with the archaeologists the upcoming plans that were to be imposed on the archaeological park. They gathered on the south side of the hill, posted their banners on the fences and had a discussion with the head archaeologist of the space at the time, Mrs. Lazaridou. While addressing the residents, Mrs. Lazaridou reassured them that the plans to set up further fencing around the hill were necessary for the demarcation of the archaeological site. The residents insisted that she was in fact concealing the potential entry fee that would be introduced to the hill. After an intense dialogue between representatives of the assembly and the archaeologist, the residents proceeded in working together in order to bring down the fences. The first assembly has been recounted to me on numerous occasions; the most notable one was when I was invited by members of the movement to view the videos that were recorded on the day, including their personal commentary on the intricate details of the protest. Andreas, prominent member of the movement, was kind enough to share with me the videos of the assembly, still-frames of which can be seen below (see Figures in composition 7.1).

The events that followed were to mark the beginning of a turbulent relationship. The main one—the one that most remember as the moment that changed everything—was the night residents met up late at night in the days following the November 3rd assembly to remove additional fences the Archaeological Service had set up to restrict access to the hill. That night comes up often in discussion; it was the night that brought the residents together, mobilised them for a cause they felt close to their hearts and one that would prompt them to organise and to create a residential movement. This act of resistance has become a milestone in the recent history of urban movements in Athens. It often comes up in conversation with activists from other neighbourhoods as a key instance of victory for residential activism. In many cases, I heard of their participation in the plan
to remove the erected fencing, as they were called to action in order to help the residents living near Philopappou Hill on that very night, a testimony to the solidarity existing between movements in Athens. Since then, local actors have become well-acquainted with the police and state services, in some cases resulting in their arrest. According to the activists I have spoken to, the works and plans that the State was imposing upon the space threatened the years of carefreeness on the Hill. The developments that followed, quickly transformed into what they feel was an act of exclusion—one that prompted the residents to unite and to take action. Sophia, describes the events that transpired the night residents and activists removed the fences set up on the Hill by the Service, becoming noticeably emotional. She recalls the swiftness of those involved in bringing down the fence, equipped with tools most of which she had never seen before, the team effort it took and the feeling of success they felt. It seems that 2002 was the year that changed everything.
Figure 7.1 The residents’ first assembly leads to the destruction of the fencing on November 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 2002 (still frames from Andreas’s personal collection).
7.1.1 Clashing Love

The archaeologists who were active on the hill when the above clashes occurred provide a different view of the events. I was given the opportunity to interview them after being acquainted with Mrs. Lazaridou during the first Dialogues in Archaeology Conference in Athens (2015), where I coordinated a workshop on residents’ associations whose causes are linked with archaeological sites. Mrs. Lazaridou welcomed me to her home for what turned out to be a four hour recorded interview, along with her friend and colleague at the time, Mrs. Vogiatzoglou. They were both very accommodating but also very keen on finding out why I had chosen to conduct my research—reminding me every so often the burden of an archaeologist’s duty to preserve the past against all odds.

When I asked them about the November 3rd tearing down of the fences by the residents, Mrs. Vogiatzoglou gave me her account of the events:

“[…]they went ahead and arranged an assembly to take down the fences that had begun to be erected, without seeing what the studies were, what they were predicting, what the thoughts were, nothing. After the assembly and after they had taken down the first fences—they started to say ‘let's go to Petralona’ [and remove more fences].”

(Vogiatzoglou, personal communication, 17/11/2015)

She goes on to explain that she frequently held discussions with the residents so as to inform them about upcoming plans to be applied on the hills, along with her colleague, Mrs. Lazaridou. The now-retired archaeologists tell me of a group discussion they attended before the events of November 3rd at a Parent’s Association in Petralona, where they were invited to present the plans the Service and the UAAS Programme had for the archaeological park.

“[…] we experienced an entire ordeal with the situation [at Philopappou]. We brought with us the representative of the Unification Programme and went to Petralona […] with our maps and studies, in order to inform the Parent’s Association what is happening. And one of the members from the Philopappou Movement kept yelling [at us]: ‘you are telling us lies!’ Who is lying? I mean, there was no possibility of communication. We tried to explain to them honestly and clearly what is to be done, because either way you could not lie to them, the studies were approved by the Central Archaeological Council […] [but] they wanted to do their own thing […] without ever wanting to listen [to us]. First lie: accessibility. Massive lie. These were never supported in the studies for Philopappou. The official report said that the space would be open, demarcated because it constitutes a park, revealing its dual nature as an archaeological site
and a park. To be honest, I’m not sure if we emphasised [at the time] if the space would be open during the day and closed at night. Whatever the case, that was the plan […] Having a space that is free and open, but that closes at night.”

(Vogiatzoglou, personal communication, 17/11/2015)

Both archaeologists speak passionately about the preservation of the hills’ archaeological heritage and cultural significance. Their sense of stewardship is evident through their description of the events and the way they proceeded in dealing with the increase of contestation from the residents’ part. It is apparent that their approach is top-down, looking to educate and communicate the pending plans legislated by the UAAS programme as well as the CAC—the official, state-coordinated studies and decisions concerning the future of the hills. They believe that the lack of an effective communication with the residents of Philopappou was detrimental to the space, and explain that it is necessary to keep in mind the importance of protecting archaeological/historic heritage above all. Mrs. Vogiatzoglou further informs me of her duty to protect the archaeological space when she was an active member of the Greek Archaeological Service before her retirement:

“[…] we defended the public interest which I consider sacred […] there are certain basic principles. You defend the space because if you don’t, the next generation will not have it. Do you understand? […] an archaeological site has its restrictions. You will either accept that it’s an archaeological site, or that it isn’t.”

(Vogiatzoglou, personal communication, 17/11/2015)

Mrs. Vogiatzoglou’s definition of the public interest involves the protection and preservation of the park for future generations. What constitutes ‘the public’ for her as an archaeologist can further reflect the common perception of archaeological heritage as belonging to the public, but under specific rules of engagement and interaction. It is evident that she feels archaeological sites should be restricted by principle; perhaps this constitutes an indication of the inherent mode of disciplinary practices and mentalities which characterise the archaeological field in many places around the world and in Greece as well. Her professional identity as an archaeologist supersedes her identity as a citizen and resident of the city, prioritising the protection of the past for the future, without considering the present. Nevertheless, Mrs. Lazaridou promptly argues that both she and Mrs. Vogiatzoglou believe residential activism is important as they too are actively involved in the protection of public spaces in their own neighbourhoods. They discuss their mobilisation as active residents, expressing their understanding for the need to protect a particular space:

“We are members of residential movements too. One of us [Vogiatzoglou] rushing to save the Adraneio [Hadrian Aqueduct] and all the industrial buildings—not only of Nea Ionia [her neighbourhood]—but throughout Greece. I have been struggling
Mrs. Vogiatzoglou’s endeavour in her neighbourhood is coincidently associated with archaeological remnants, however in this particular case she views herself as a resident mobilising for a cause, rather than an archaeologist who is trying to preserve the past. She informs me that her professional experience has certainly played a catalytic role in the way she has proceeded as a resident, but nevertheless identifies this particular situation as one rooted in residential activism. In addition, Mrs. Lazaridou’s activism in her district has been focused on the protection of a park and the abandoned historic buildings within the space. Their investment and dedication to these causes are discernible in the way they describe their mobilisation to protect these spaces; this is interesting to me because it reinforces the notion that there are co-existing—and sometimes, clashing identities—within the same individual. For me this confirms yet again, how complex and multifaceted engagements with spaces are. This fact permeates and re-occurs in my research and is one of the more fascinating aspects as it demonstrates the different levels of identity, identification with space, and the multiple perceptions and significations attributed to these. This particular paradigm brings to mind Hamilakis’s (2007: 22-24) discussion of a threefold political ethic; would the archaeologists in this case be able to prioritise their social and political identities over their professional one in the case of Philopappou? Or view the particular site beyond standardised notions of the archaeological record? It seems to me that through their residential mobilisation they are familiar with addressing the political dimensions within and outside the discipline, however—in regards to Philopappou—their professional identity superseded their personal one.

Overall, a key element emanates here: both residents and archaeologists have a special interest in protecting Philopappou Hill. They do so, however, from very different perspectives.

7.1.2 Citizens in Action

Since ‘the night to remember’, the Philopappou Movement has been very vocal in expressing their dissatisfaction towards a number of state authorities that have imposed significant changes to their surroundings whilst simultaneously failing to deal with others. They have been very diligent in their legal course of action, meticulously researching official documents relating to the hills and discovering inconsistencies or loopholes that have been detrimental to the hills.

The movement has determinedly presented the issues which they felt need to be addressed and resolved throughout the years, utilising various mediums such as a blog chronicling their activities, posters, leaflets, brochures, assemblies as well as meetings with the Municipality of Athens and through the organisation of conferences and workshops. The most prominent issues that the
movement claims need to be resolved or given attention to are thoroughly presented in their blog with supporting official documents (Philopappou Residents’ Blogspot 2007b):

1) the hills’ operation as a free space, open at all hours of the day and night.

2) the restoration and appropriate use of Pikionis’s works and pathways (including the Loumbardiaris Café).

3) the hills’ environmental maintenance and conservation (including the obstruction of any potential works that could endanger the hills’ ecosystem).

4) the illegal operation and expansion of the fine-dining restaurant Dionysus, as well as the necessary measures needed to be undertaken by the Municipality of Athens to restore the space where Dionysus is located, and to re-integrate it into the greater area.

The first matter—the hills’ status as an open space and accessible at all hours—has been dealt with on numerous occasions, such as the events described above. In fact, in the early years of the clashes between residents and state services, the Ministry of Culture published a press release in response to the media attention the movement’s cause had received against the imposition of an entrance fee. The Ministry of Culture clarified:

“The fencing of the archaeological site and the installation of gates are intended only for the protection/guarding of the scattered antiquities within the area, and the Ministry of Culture has never had any intention of issuing an entrance fee to this space, which constitutes one of the most importance archaeological sites in Athens and one of the few green spaces of the city—an element that makes it a pole of attraction for the locals and a place of promenade and recreation.”

(Ministry of Culture 2004)

More recently, the movement’s prevention of further fencing—this time involving the enclosure of the Pnyx—was materialised in January of 2015 (for which I was informed urgently via email and phone). It was only a few months later that the movement’s efforts came into fruition. In a decision made by the Hellenic Council of State in late May of 2015 (Council of State 2015), the public was granted access to the Western Hills of the Acropolis at all times—night and day—reversing thus the 2008 decision set by the Minister of Culture at the time, which would treat the hills as an organised archaeological site with restricted access and the potential imposition of an entrance fee. Among others, the Council’s 2015 decision highlights that Law No. 3028/2002 (cf. Ministry of Culture 2002b) On the Protection of Antiquities and Cultural Heritage in General,

“establishes the special right of citizens to free access and interaction with cultural heritage, which is part of the broader right of enjoyment of the cultural environment...Moreover, the above constitutes a facet of the right to the free
development of personality (a. 5 par. 1 Constitution). Given that in this case, the Philopappou Hill has always been one of the few recreational and walking spaces in the city’s centre (which is attested by the paved configuration paths and café created by architect D. Pikionis during the 1950s), it is harmoniously and closely connected with the life of the city and residents and the contested measure [of the 2008 decision], which seeks restriction to free public access to it, makes this decision [of reversal] a necessary intervention for the aforementioned right."

(Hellenic Council of State 2015, my translation)

This decision of reversal echoes Lefebvre’s (1996 [1968]) concept of the right to the city. It establishes the right for people to engage with heritage and most importantly indicates that it contributes to their “free development of personality”. As such, it affirms the idea that citizens should have the right to participate in the city, and as Harvey argues, to be able to change themselves through changing the city. Of course, this decision does not necessarily endorse physical changes to the landscape by the people—it still is an archaeological site—but it institutes the idea that it is open, free and accessible, integrated in the urban life of the city. It enables this idea to be further embedded in the people’s minds, proactively facilitating a relationship with the space and its heritage. Sophia described this victory on the movement’s part as a testament to the residents’ efforts in achieving their goal and most importantly, making it institutional.

Figure 7.2 The movement celebrates their victory on the Pnyx (Philopappou Residents’ Movement Facebook Page, 2015).
The second matter that concerns the movement—the preservation and restoration of Pikionis’s architectural interventions such as the pathways and the Loumbardiaris Café—involves issues that are yet to be resolved in their totality. Local residents claim that the Service has not taken enough measures to protect the pathways from the destruction they endure by incoming motorists (including police vehicles and the Service’s cars). Residents additionally assert that the state has also failed to protect, restore, and reactivate the Loumbardiaris Café. Dimosthenis believes that the café’s closing during the early years of the UAAS Programme was a way for the Service to gradually debilitate the free use of the space by the public. Throughout the years, the movement has actively proceeded in fighting for the café’s reactivation through petitions, assemblies and cleaning activities. One such call to action appropriates a motif from Pikionis’s work upon the hills, welcoming residents and friends of the hill to “bring back to life” the café at Loumbardiaris (see Figure 7.3). The leaflet reproduces Pikonis’s work on the pedestrian pathways of the hill (Figure 7.4) whilst urging the Ministry of Culture to take action against the café’s abandonment and highlights the need for it to reactivate as a “modest café without further alterations—just like its creator designed it.”

Figures 7.3 (left) and 7.4 (right):
“Bring the Loumbardiaris Café back to life”—the movement’s call to action to clean the space and to highlight the need to reactivate the café (2011). Pikionis’s work inspired the leaflet (2014).
Sophia claims that Pikionis is Greece’s Gaudi. She asserts that in Spain, “they use Gaudi’s work to make money, whereas here, we destroy [Pikionis’s] work.” Her reference to architect Antoni Gaudi’s work at Park Güell in Barcelona shares very similar features to the case of Philopappou Hill, as previously discussed in Chapter 3. Her point made me think about the way the hill’s modern architectural heritage has been overshadowed as its co-existence with antiquities has prompted state services to prioritise the ancient past over modern interventions. This in turn is a parallel paradigm to the attention provided to archaeological sites that are considered of high cultural value as opposed to sites which do not directly link to the nation’s narrative and identity. This hierarchy also extends to the two archaeological parks studied for this research; while Philopappou Hill receives partial or minimal attention in comparison to the Acropolis, it is much more highly regarded when compared to Plato’s Academy—precisely because of its proximity to the Sacred Rock. This hierarchy of value can be traced to the development of the archaeological discipline and the creation of a classically-centred national narrative inspired by the notion of cultural continuity (Kitromilides 1996: 167-168), providing ‘secondary’ significance to other eras such as the Byzantine and prehistoric periods, and even lesser importance to more modern material traces. As will be discussed in the following chapter, this is not exclusively a matter of archaeological practice—but also one that permeates a society’s sociopolitical milieu.

The third issue the movement is concerned with is the environmental maintenance and care of the hills. This particular matter has led the movement to intense clashes with the Archaeological Service. The Service has strictly forbidden any interventions by activists to tend to the hill’s natural habitat, the former claiming that the latter would endanger the archaeological remnants of the hill. The residents’ attempts to plant new trees have resulted to official statements of complaint to the police and even in the arrest and trial of both members of the movement and the Service. I had the chance to discuss the tree-planting incident that took place in 2008 with Sophia. Despite being one of the numerous confrontations residents had with the Service, this one is distinctly remembered by the community as it was materialised in the presence of police and also led the Archaeological Service to file an official complaint against three residents. Sophia informs me that the residents’ intention was to re-plant segments of the northwestern side of the hill as it was bare—the numerous fires in previous years had burned down a lot of the flora:

“[…] there was nothing there, it was us who planted the trees, in a now infamous planting campaign during which a couple of MAT squads [riot police] were called in— the residents went there and were confronted by the squads. The archaeologists [names removed] were also there and the MAT squads ended up guarding us while we were planting trees (laughter).”

(Sophia, personal communication, 13/11/2015)

The three residents that were taken to court by the Service were acquitted five years later, in June of 2013. My participants argue that apart from what they felt was an unreasonable response from the Service in regards to tree-planting, as they felt it was an act to protect the hill particularly because the Service, the Municipality of Athens, as well as the UAAS Programme had not taken the initiative to re-plant the area. Sophia goes on to tell me that despite the clashes that have taken place, at least one good thing has come from this:

“We had started planting some trees, and then a friend from the neighbourhood, [name removed] — he decided to handle it personally. He now watches the trees from his house with binoculars. He digs there every Saturday and the whole landscape has changed. It all started with that tree-planting but that was just the beginning.”

(Sophia, personal communication, 13/11/2015)

When I asked her how [name removed] has managed not to become involved or clash directly with the Archaeological Service, Sophia asserts that the archaeologists did not have a problem with [name removed] working on his own and tending to the plants on the northwestern part of the hill. Nevertheless, she believes that the reason they were opposed to the movement operating as a group and planting trees on the hill because, in her words:

“[the archaeologists] were opposing the official action. Whatever it was that sounded like an activist action plan [...] They didn’t want people to know that the residents were doing something that clashed with their authority. Because, unfortunately, collaboration was not an option, the only way was to clash with them. That was the problem. They couldn’t even fathom the possibility of discussing with the residents. Of course, if they had, then they’d also have to talk about the issue of accessing the hill and the encroachment incidents and everything else, but [...]”

(Sophia, personal communication, 13/11/2015)

Her understanding of the service’s actions reflects the rudimentary elements of a relationship of difference as discussed by Hall (1996), between the residents and archaeologists. The latter’s exclusionary practices and unwillingness to allow actions resembling a collective mobilisation demonstrates the manifestation of antagonistic discourses, practices and positions. These ultimately sets the two apart and fuels their identification as opposing forces.

Sophia recalls wanting to become an archaeologist as a young girl but that her mother was “wise to encourage” her to embark on a different path. She tells me that her view of the Service changed drastically after her involvement with the residents’ effort to reclaim the hill. She feels that the
residents have always been open to discussing matters with the archaeologists but the latter do not want to listen to what they have to say. She believes that a collaboration would have been constructive in finding ways to protect the hill and the archaeological remnants however now, and after so many incidents of contestation, such a relationship would be impossible to build. It comes as no surprise that she often refers to the movement and its community as the little “Gaul Village”—a reference to the famous *Asterix the Gaul* comics and the village’s resistance to fall to the hands of the conquering Romans.

She is still surprised as to how the archaeologists responded to the residents’ tree-planting initiative—one that was meant to rejuvenate the space—but had turned a blind eye to the illegal digging that had taken place at the *Dionysus* fine-dining restaurant at the foot of the hill. The movement’s blog best summarises the thoughts on the particular matter in one sentence:

“The ‘Guardian-Ephorate’ never filed a complaint for THE DIGGING at Dionysus, the famous restaurant that is located within the limits of OUR hill from which 400 (yes, you read correctly, 400) cubic meters of soil between 1995 and 2003 were removed without [official] permission and without supervision [from the Ephorate].”

(Philopappou Residents’ Blogspot 2015a, my translation. Emphasis as seen in original text)

The blog’s post sarcastically characterises the First Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities as a ‘guardian’ that has failed to battle against private interests causing extreme damage to the hill. The use of the word ‘guardian’ is indicative of the authoritative and hegemonic status associated with the archaeological service as stewards of the past in Greek society. They undermine and negate the service’s standing by asserting that despite their power to officially intervene with damaging procedures, they failed to do so. Furthermore, the choice and emphasis of the term “our hill” denotes a much deeper battle that has increasingly augmented in time between the movement and the archaeologists; it directly connects to their sense of ownership of the hill and the clashing practices utilised in its protection and safeguarding.

The movement claims that the hill has been misused and officially neglected by state services for the financial gain of the owners of the fine-dining restaurant, *Dionysus*, insinuating their questionable allegiances and their lack to care for the space’s integrity. More specifically, they accuse the archaeological service for not enforcing the law and not dealing effectively with state corruption and private business interests. The restaurant has extended its parking space therefore disrupting trafficking networks, even though they do not legally own the space. It has also extended its premises over the years, endangering the park further (see Figure 7.5). Most notably, the State has subtly transferred the ownership of the space *Dionysus* occupies, from the Municipality of Athens to the Greek National Tourism Organisation (EOT), essentially making it possible to sell
through the Hellenic Republic Asset Development Fund (HRADF). This can be seen in the inconsistencies between the Declaratory Acts of 1993 and 2014 (see Appendix J). The first states that the restaurant was in fact built by the Greek National Tourism Organisation but the space is claimed by the Municipality of Athens. Additionally, it lists the constructed surface of the restaurant as 1,150 m². However, the latter act declares that the space has been expropriated by the Ministry of Public Works and transferred its ownership to the Greek National Tourism Organisation, instead of the Municipality of Athens. It also lists the constructed surface of the restaurant as 1,165.15 m², thus additionally legitimising the extensions made to the restaurant upon the Hill. Local activists claim that the main issue lies in the Municipality’s inactivity (despite originally having the ownership of the space) as well as the Archaeological Service’s refusal to take a stance on the matter. This ‘subtle’ transfer of ownership as well as the supplementary space provided to the restaurant is a matter that the residential activists have been fighting against for several years, repeatedly attempting to intervene with the multiple intrusions and exploitations of the hill by the restaurant, filing a cancellation request to the Court of Appeals as well as an extrajudicial statement claiming that the restaurant is operating and expanding illegally. The matter was partially resolved in 2017 when the Municipality of Athens declared the 13 acres of land (upon which a segment of it consists of the fine-dining restaurant) as part of their land registry. Moreover, in December of 2018, the Minister of Tourism officially modified the Declaratory Act of 2014, changing the phrasing which shifted the ownership of the Dionysus restaurant from the EOT (see Appendix K). These modifications were considered a great win for the movement, however the matter of the metres attributed to restaurant is yet to be resolved as of February 2019. Effectively, the Philopappou Movement is systematically resisting what Habermas (1987: 185) saw as the deterioration of the public sphere against the increasing private interests which have violently pervaded the public sphere.

56 The HRADF was created to “leverage[s] the State private property assigned to it by Hellenic Republic [sic], according to the country’s international obligations and the Medium-Term Fiscal Strategy” (HRADF 2018). Essentially, the Fund was created in order to alleviate the country’s current financial debt by restricting governmental intervention in the privatisation process.
In a protest organised by the movement on Clean Monday of 2017, I actively participated in distributing leaflets and informing members of the public about the potential sale of thirteen acres of land adjacent to Dionysus. We disseminated an open letter to the Mayor of Athens Mr. Kaminis (see Appendix L), urging him to take the necessary measures to ensure the land is legally declared as part of Municipal property—hence belonging to the citizens of Athens. Due to the religious holiday, the movement believed it was a good opportunity to mobilise as the mayor was due to visit the hill for the Koulouma celebrations. It was intriguing to see how people reacted to our protest. Most visitors ignored our leaflets, perhaps because they were not interested in knowing what it was
we wanted to tell them; they were probably coming from other districts of Athens specifically for
the Koulouma festivities. Others, most of them residents of the surrounding neighbourhoods of the
hill, were very keen on learning about potential plans that might endanger the park. They wanted to
know what they can do to help and were curious to know when the movement would have an
assembly so as to participate themselves. Surprisingly (to me, but also to members of the
movement), there were members of the public that believed it was a good plan to bring foreign
investors to buy the land plot next to Dionysus. They argued that because of the crisis, Greece
desperately needs to make use of public property so as to alleviate the country’s debt as much as
possible. Some individuals became very passionate about the right of the state to sell land to private
investors; Sophia and Andreas were promptly there to calmly debate with them and to explain the
stakes of such an undertaking.

Beyond the leaflets and discussions that day, the movement had created several banners to inform
passersby about the potential dangers to the hill. One banner was specifically made to welcome the
Mayor with a ‘clean’ message, appealing to his ethical sensibility (see Figures 7.5-7.6), whilst
another warned him that the movement will not allow segments of the hill to be lost within “the
black hole of debt” through the HRADF. The powerful presence of the movement that day, the
variety of means to deliver their message by confronting public authority, brings to mind
Habermas’s (1989) concept of the public sphere. In this particular protest—much like in many
others—the movement assertively formulated a space for democratic exchange with public
authority within the public sphere. They created a space of representation through which they
‘performed’ their form of social intervention, seeking to generate new possibilities for spatial
practices, as Harvey (1987: 266) proposes through his intersection of Lefebvre’s conceptual triad of
different spaces with varying types of spatial practices.
Figure 7.6 “Mr. KAMINIS, you will commit a BREACH OF TRUST at the expense of the Municipality of Athens or you will do what is REQUIRED FROM YOU BY LAW” (2017).

Figure 7.7 “Mr. Kaminis/ For the Dionysus Scandal… we will not allow the collusion between the Municipality and the Greek National Tourism Organization to ‘throw’ [Philopappou] into the black hole of debt” (2017).
Overall, the movement has collectively counteracted actions imposed by state authorities regarding all of the four main issues discussed in the beginning of this section. Members of the movement claim that there are both political and financial motives concealed in the attempted restrictions of the hill from 2002 on, initially through the extensive urban re-development works part of the preparations for the Athens 2004 Olympics and eventually through the possibility of selling segments of the hill through the Hellenic Asset Development Fund. These claims further reflect a general issue in Greece, where citizens assert that state or municipal/local authorities are not only interested in selling public land, but are also involved in illegal urban renovations or re-developments in order to absorb funds on construction loans and taxpayers’ money.

7.2 The Residents Take Initiative

The neighborhood of Plato’s Academy is home to an extended network of movements, assemblies, initiatives and committees actively dealing with various forms of ‘degradation’ and social injustices occurring in their neighbourhoods. Taking into consideration the area’s dense population, high unemployment rates and frequent inter-cultural tension, these groups aim to support each other against these issues. They provide the basic necessities for survival to their fellow neighbours such as food, clothing, shelter, and equal access to health services. They further organise interventions and protests in an effort to fight against poverty, unemployment, and social injustices in a community with an increase in racism and acts of violence. The prominent residential and social groups mobilised in the region include the People’s Assembly of Kolonos, Sepolia and Plato’s Academy, the Residents’ Committee of Plato’s Academy, as well as the Cooperative Café. The extensive interventions and actions employed by these movements alone, as well as their political
foundations, compositions and ideologies would require an additional thesis. For this reason, this research focuses on the direct engagements and interventions concerning the archaeological park of Plato’s Academy.

The Residents Committee of Plato’s Academy was formed in 2008, during a time in which the neighbourhood witnessed a vast change in its urban planning. More specifically, according to member and ex-municipal nominee for Athens’ Fourth Municipal District with SYRIZA’s municipal movement “Anoiti Poli” (Open City) Athina Mertzelou (2009a), the Committee was created “by the need to resist the Athens Prefecture and contractors/developers in the area”.

The neighbourhood of Plato’s Academy has been a location of interest for private investment for numerous years, both before the residents’ organised mobilisation and well after the creation of the Residents’ committee. Due to its largely industrial composition, with extensive plots of land and out-of-use industrial complexes and buildings, it is considered a prime location for development by private and state interests. Additionally, the archaeological park of Plato’s Academy was intended to be included to the UAAS Programme but never did, despite the programme’s almost twenty-year existence before its discontinuation in 2014 (Ministry of Administrative Reconstruction 2014). The combination of these two elements, led the park and its surrounding neighbourhood to be the focus of a number of potential development plans which still exist today.

One of the very first matters the residents mobilised for was to resist the construction of two office buildings by the Athens Prefecture in 2008 which would be located 300 meters from the archaeological park. The residents claim that they had previously communicated with the Prefecture, requesting for the particular space to be provided for additional public schools in the neighbourhood. Instead, they insist that not only would the construction of these buildings create further traffic congestion in the area, but it would endanger the existing students which attend school in nearby campuses. Moreover, the Committee was concerned that the excavations materialised on site in preparation for the construction of the buildings would be silenced, as they were funded by the Prefecture. According to the numerous blog posts, leaflets, newspaper articles disseminated by the provisional Committee of the neighbourhood, they felt that the space should be used either as a preschool for toddlers living in the neighbourhood or modified into a park as an extension of the archaeological park of Plato’s Academy (Residential Committee Blogspot 2008).

The particular conflict led to extensive media attention (including a concert-protest with famous singers organised by a popular private TV station), protest marches including school children (see Figures 7.9 and 7.10), and discussions in parliament—not only in regards to development plans that could potentially endanger the community—but more specifically the commercialisation of the archaeological site and by extension, the neighbourhood’s heritage. A common sentiment at the time—which resonates to the present—is that of indignation towards state services and political parties which residents feel have further enabled their neighbourhood’s degradation.
Figure 7.9 “We demand the land plot for the 130th Kindergarten/We want the history of our neighbourhood not its degradation” (Photo Credit: Residential Committee Blogspot 2010 [2008]).

Figure 7.10 “HANDS OFF AKADIMIA PLATONOS”. Photo Credit: Akadimia Platonos I Efimerida.

For more information on the struggle to protect the local schools from the Athens Prefecture, see: http://akadimia-platonos.blogspot.com/2010/07/blog-post_26.html. [Last Accessed: 08/12/2018].
The struggle to protect the neighbourhood from the Prefecture’s plan to create office spaces in 2008 led to the formation both of the Committee as well as its claims in relation to the future of the archaeological park. Since then, the Committee fought for the inclusion of the park in the UAAS Programme plans. They have repeatedly expressed their disappointment in regards to the failure of the plan to reach their neighbourhood as they insist this would ultimately bring the type of ‘development’ they believe the space deserves, as opposed to the development real estate companies are trying to impose in their area. It was during the Committee’s first mobilisations which cemented the idea of the archaeological site of Plato’s Academy to presently become a centre of knowledge and an archetypal educational park. They have consistently argued that the real revitalisation of the archaeological park—and by extension, of the neighbourhood—entails “its protection and promotion of [its] historical and cultural significance” maintaining that the park needs to “remain open to citizens and a part of the residents’ daily lives” (Vassou and Papahristoudi n.d.). This argument is further conveyed through their support for the construction of the Museum of the City of Athens which they believe will contribute to the neighbourhood’s identity as an educational and cultural centre. Furthermore, it has been noted (ibid.) that the initial announcement for the construction of the museum has been perhaps the prime attraction for investors in the area—it is their apparent desire to contribute to the park’s “regeneration”. Despite conflicting circumstances, members of the community have insisted that if the planned museum takes 30 acres of land, it would take over half of the northern segment of the park (Plato’s Academy Blogspot 2009). Its intended location would restrict the present football and basketball courts existing on the park and would endanger the bordering Sacred House of Akadimos bordering the potential structure. They have thus repeatedly proposed alternative locations for the construction of the museum.

The Committee further claims that the real rejuvenation of the residential areas of the neighbourhood will by sufficiently upgraded with the establishment of all the necessary infrastructures such as roads, efficient sanitation, and free spaces for recreation and sports (ibid.). As for the industrial complex situated on the northwest segment of the area, they request for its urban regeneration—“focusing on culture and knowledge”—against speculative bubble investments which do not contribute to the urgent need for more job opportunities (ibid.).

The idea of revitilising the area through the park’s historicity is interesting as it evokes a kind of ‘gentrification’ which of course is heritage-oriented. It is very different to the way Philopappou residents perceive the hill, as the community of Plato’s Academy desire the adoption of and connection to the national narrative and the classical past. They do so whilst simultaneously fighting for the protection of the park from present neoliberal and capitalist endeavours in order to safeguard their everyday, social interactions with it. In many ways, this desire echoes Herzfeld’s (1991) clash between social and monumental time, however in the case of Plato’s Academy the prominence and promotion of the past is one that they hope for.
It is evident that the park is central in the Committee’s reclamations of public space and the betterment of the neighbourhood’s social and economic functions; according to their claims, the park’s rejuvenation and the promotion of its historicity will contribute to fighting against the region’s long-lasting degradation. Upon asking Mihalis about the successful features of the Residential Committee, he provided a response which concisely summarises the points discussed above. He touches upon the Committee’s victories to protect public spaces, the centrality and historical significance of the archaeological park, and the need for solidarity in the neighbourhood:

“The Residential Committee was able to protect segments of the park which have historical value from being passed on to the Prefecture or to REDS [private company aiming to build mall], we prevented the destruction of the communal garden [λαχανόκηπος]. We did all these things so that Plato’s Academy would not be viewed by every contractor as a space that would be divided and exploited commercially. That’s what we attempted to do and we achieved it to a great extent. The other reason is precisely because the [space’s] historicity is of great interest to the residents and that is why we have their acceptance and their participation in the mobilisations made for [various] issues. In regards to the Committee’s solidarity, we try to help people who are in a difficult circumstances through the Steki. Whenever someone needs something, we give or if we want to, we also receive things [...] We hold collective kitchens, tutoring schools [φροντιστήρια or
frontistiria] for children of all ages, a basic library for them to use. We also have film screenings, or help and inform people about [home] auctions. There is also collaboration with committees from other neighbourhoods, but it is not developed to the extent that it should be.”

(Mihalis, personal communication, 29/10/15)

For Mihalis, the reclamations of public spaces in the neighbourhood are directly paralleled to the committee’s resistance against the space’s commercial exploitation. These demonstrate the residents’ unwavering fight against what Harvey (2009: 326) calls “accumulation by dispossession” through practices of deregulation and privatisation by exploiting low-income populations and gradually leading to their displacement. It is important to note that Mihalis views the park’s historical significance as a key element in uniting the community to fight against these systematic neoliberal advances.

One of the more specific requests proposed by the Committee in 2013—which was of particular interest to me and in my mind encapsulates the above causes—was to beautify Monastiriou Street (adjacent to the park) as well as other prime locations with graffiti.58 It is an unusual request considering the conflicting feelings existing about graffiti, especially within an archaeological site. Nevertheless, in 2014 the artist WD was invited to use the Municipality’s service building located in the park as a canvas (see Figure 7.12). His art was welcomed by the Committee, presenting it on their blog as a “magnificent image” which the artist was inspired to create through “the scent of friendship and love which prevails in the park for all creatures. For all creatures without discriminations” (Residential Committee Blogspot 2014).

58 For more information, see Athina Mertzelou’s (2009b) proposal to the “Municipality of Athens’ Supporter of the Citizen and of Business” conference (Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=viSOzz7-qPU). [Last Accessed: 21/11/2018].
7.2.1 Academy Gardens

The major threat to the archaeological park currently in development (since 2008) is the plan to construct a mall near the archaeological park, suitably named *Academy Gardens*. This matter has become a central issue for all movements of the area, as they oppose the construction of the mall on a number of grounds, as will be discussed below. It received extensive coverage in a variety of mediums and settings, including a Presidential Decree publicised through the Government Gazette (ΦΕΚ 2013 ΑΑΠ/165), which initially resulted in strong objections by a number of (primarily) leftist parties, claiming that the state is exploiting the cultural and environmental character of the area through capitalist plans and policies. Amongst the various reasons opposing the construction, these parties (including the majority of the local community) claim that the mall will negatively affect the protection and promotion of the archaeological park and the prospects for the area’s sustainable development. Additionally, during the initial years of the plan, both leftist MPs and local residents that the construction of the mall would not only destroy industrial monuments located in the area, but would also further impede the urban development of the neighbourhood and will result in social injustice in that the creation of a mall will inevitable shut down local businesses and lead to higher unemployment rates. In April of 2011, the Mouzaki textile complex—a historical landmark of the area’s industrial heritage—was eventually demolished.59

---

One of the main obstacles which has methodically halted the materialisation of the mall up until July of 2016, was the Central Archaeological Council’s decision that the permissible height for buildings in the specific land plot bought by foreign real estate companies (Artume-BlackRock) would not exceed 17.5 meters. Nevertheless, the CAC overturned the specific clause by a majority vote, amending the permissible height for construction to reach 21 meters. This decision reveals a level of crypto-colonialism as expressed by Herzfeld (2002) and the parallel between the imposition of neoliberal tactics which inevitably lead to economic and cultural subjugation. The CAC’s ruling was met with strong disapproval by the residents of Plato’s Academy as well as the Association of Greek Archaeologists, whilst also clashing with the proposals made by the Athens Ephorate of Antiquities which is associated with the archaeological park. This significant modification in the permissible height ultimately provided the Minister of Environment and Energy, Giorgos Stathakis, the green light to sign the Presidential Decree with the terms of construction in the allocated land plot in January of 2018.

In regards to the social, urban and economic conditions of the area, the active residents of Plato’s Academy claim that the construction of a mall will potentially lead to the destruction of small businesses in the neighbourhood as well as those located in the surrounding neighbourhoods. The mall will also create expendable workers, individuals working with minimum wage and the inevitable abolition of non-working Sundays as a result of the establishment of large commercial chain stores. Additionally, according to the residents, the mall would contribute to the existing traffic congestion and further minimise the open, public spaces in the neighbourhood by cementing them and limiting them to the public. The traffic congestion will also affect the neighbourhood’s environmental element.

More specifically to the archaeological park, the Residents’ Committee along with a number of collectivities and movements in the neighbourhood and beyond, claim that the construction of the mall means (see original leaflet in Appendix M):

“the commercialisation of a world-class cultural asset, with the ‘commercial use’ of the name Academy in the title of a department store (Academy Gardens) and the conversion of the archaeological site into a Mall courtyard… [We demand] actual upgrading of the Archaeological Site, protection and promotion of its great historical and cultural value, open to the citizens and everyday life of the residents, who were the only ones capable of preserving its existence…[For the] construction of the Museum of the City of Athens. Cultural wealth will not become promotional material on a Mall floor, as a "compensatory benefit".

(Leaflet by Coordinating Committee of Collectivities in Plato’s Academy 2017).

The residents argue that the commercialisation and exploitation of Plato’s Academy for the construction of a mall is not the kind of upgrade they want for their neighbourhood.
Their characterisation of the space as a “world-class cultural asset” is of importance here; it suggests that the protection of the park as well as the hindrance of the neighbourhood’s gentrification, would benefit from the state’s official recognition—actively, and not just in theory—of the Academy’s cultural significance and value. As such, it would channel the necessary funding to protect it and promote it accordingly, as it does with other sites—most prominently of course, with national mega-sites. The residents also stress they are the “only ones” who are capable of the park’s active safeguarding and preservation. This directly juxtaposes the archaeologists’ view of the state tending to the care of antiquities at the Academy as discussed in Chapter 4. It demonstrates a rupture vis-à-vis the stewardship of the Academy and by extension, its ownership.

At the time these lines were written, the residents have been systematically opposing the construction of the mall for the past ten years. They have frequent meetings to discuss the different challenges imposed by the state regulations paving the way for the mall, searching for ways to resist further progress of construction plans. Furthermore, they hold a number of open discussions/workshops with other movements and collectivities from neighbouring areas, as well as with residential activists from other countries. They collaborate with representatives from the local government as well as with Members of Parliament through letters, memos and parliamentary questions, in an effort to publicise the matter as much as possible. In addition, they send letters to a number of state services in order to collect necessary documents which will support their case against the construction of the mall. Moreover, the residents of Plato’s Academy utilise different modes of protesting, including musical concerts/festivals at the archaeological park, theatrical productions and a multitude of creative activities. These demonstrate the issues the neighbourhood and the park are faced with as well as the liveliness of the space and its significance to the community’s social well-being.

7.2.2 “Cultural, not Commercial Centre”

One such form of protest that I was a part of was organised by the Residents of Plato’s Academy Committee, along with collectives from the greater area including the People’s Assembly of Kolonos, Sepolia and Plato’s Academy, as well as the Solidarity Network of Education (Plato’s Academy) and Teachers’ Associations from various schools. These groups co-organised a three-day festival at the archaeological park on 27-29 of June, 2014. This was the second consecutive year the particular festival had taken place, with similar events following in subsequent years. The primary focus of the three-day event was to protest the potential construction of the mall. The motto of the festival: “We Want a Different Future for our Neighbourhoods” encompassed issues pertaining to the social, political and economic injustices present in the area. The main event consisted of an antifascist concert with a number of popular Greek artists taking the stage, supporting the residents’ aim to “fight against poverty and fascism with solidarity” (see Appendix N). Some of the numerous activities materialised included traditional games for children, shadow-
puppet theatre, an intercultural children’s choir recital, guided tours presenting the past history of the archaeological park as well as its modern history, and musical games for children and adults. On the second day of the festival entitled “One Park-Many Neighbourhoods-One Vision”, a central discussion was held regarding the construction of the mall. It was titled “Mall-insi and life don’t go together” (‘mall-insi’ being a word play consisting of the word mall and the ending ‘insi’ which together resemble the Greek word for pollution, or ‘mólnisi’). The discussion was led by representatives of the Residents’ Committees and Assemblies of Plato’s Academy and the neighbouring areas of Kolonos and Sepolia, but was also supported by two architects, an archaeologist, and a member of both the Committee and the Municipal movement Anoihti Poli. The panel was supplemented with small contributions from representative members of residential movements from neighbourhoods sharing their experience on the drastic urban reconfigurations in their areas due to the construction of malls in recent years. It was further supported with a makeshift exhibition of news articles, pictures and other documents demonstrating the history of the neighbourhood’s degradation throughout the years (Figure 7.13, see more in Appendix O). One of the subtitles to an article from April 1965 reads: “Garbage, cesspool and degradation where Plato once taught” (Figure 7.14).

Figure 7.13 Makeshift display exhibiting newspaper articles from the park’s recent history (2014).
I visited the park on the first two days of the festival and the feeling that stood out the most was the sense of neighbourhood prevalent in the area. It wasn’t just the activities that were taking place at the park for the festival that made me feel that way; Plato’s Academy has always had that effect ever since the first time I visited. It was the unforced sense of inclusion present which made every single group activity more fun and creative. The diversity of the people that participated was perhaps one of the most beautiful sights of the two days I spent there. There were people of all ages, genders, and colours sharing their experiences of the park and the reasons why they enjoy spending their time there. Before the panel’s discussion on matters of the park, there was a ‘warm-up’ role-playing game that would allow visitors and fellow residents to ‘get into’ the discussion’s ‘mood’. The game was a role-play between two teams: the ‘good’ team and the ‘bad’ team (these names were perhaps chosen so as to make the game more accessible to our younger participants). We were set to stand side-by-side facing the other team (I participated as part of the ‘good’ team) and were told that each team would be given a letter which would enable each member to run to the

Figure 7.14 “Garbage, cesspool and degradation where Plato once taught” (2014).
centre of the space separating the two teams and find a notecard in a box with the relative letter they were given. The members from both teams had to read their notecard aloud. As it turned out, the members from the good team represented the Academy’s residents, whereas members of the bad team represented those that wanted to transform the neighbourhood and exploit it for their own means. Here was the kicker: the good team had a variety of different statements and arguments to present, whereas the bad team only had one statement: “Plato’s Academy is a degraded area which needs rejuvenation and promotion as well as the creation of new job positions.” My message read: “Plato’s Academy: Cultural, not Commercial Centre.”

Once people started realising who each team was representing, they jokingly pretended (mostly the ‘bad’ guys) to rally in order to emphasise their message. They would make funny remarks each time they took the stand like: “OK guys, you won’t believe this but: Plato’s Academy is a degraded area...” or “So, I know you’ve never heard of this before, but.....”

One of the most intense moments was when one of the members of the good team took the stand and read her message in such a genuine and powerful way, showing that the imposing changes in her neighbourhood are a matter close to her heart. At that moment, the lady standing next to me turned and told me that she got goose bumps listening to the lady read the message off the note card. So did I.

Having read all of our notecards, the members from both teams were told to stand in a semi-circle and hold the backside of their notecards up (which had a letter on it) and once they were placed side-by-side read: “We Want a Different Future for our Neighbourhoods” (Figure 7.15). My entire experience at the festival conveyed a sense of community which I wasn’t even a part of, making me feel welcome and united towards a cause that wasn’t even mine but felt like it was. I felt the residents embrace not only each other but everyone that was there, even an outsider like myself.
Figure 7.15 “We Want a Different Future for our Neighbourhoods” (2014).
7.3 Concluding Thoughts

The two case studies of this research offer distinctive examples of the types of clashes existing between residents’ movements and state authorities relating to the reclamation of public space. It is evident that the residents of the respective neighbourhoods are invested in the protection of the archaeological parks located in the areas, as seen through their substantial efforts to deal with issues they feel will affect their access, environmental and cultural status. In both areas, residential activism has proven an effective force on several occasions in counteracting state decisions and policies considered detrimental to the parks.

The reclamations of the two archaeological parks by citizens encompass the greater issues existing with the implementation of neoliberal policies. It has enabled private people to unite in the public sphere as Habermas (1989) proposes, in order to express the needs of society to hegemonic structures. It has prompted residents who previously might not have been politically active within a public setting to participate in horizontal, participatory democratic processes aimed at claiming, reclaiming, and protecting public spaces. The residential activism discussed in this chapter demonstrates the powerful position archaeological sites have in reclaiming public space within the broader mobilisations associated with the reclamation of public spaces in the city. It shows that these activities have further reinforced contact with archaeological spaces and have increased awareness of the potential integration of sites in the urban environment. The extensive material produced by the movements alone is not only a testament to the hostility that has developed throughout the years between movements and state services, but also a form of extra-official heritage discourse, one that is strikingly far from the official narratives associated with these spaces. A large part of the modern cultural biography of these sites can be found in the material created and disseminated through these grassroots, available through social media, blogs with extensive archives, leaflets, brochures and local newspapers.

The acts of contestation discussed in this chapter further reveal the turbulent relationship that often exists between state services and local communities. As I observed through my discussions with both residents and archaeologists, the clashes at Philopappou is a matter that is simultaneously very public and also very personal. Both sides express their views as part of a collective—the residents as a movement and the archaeologists as a state service—but also through an individual perspective. At times, our discussions became very intense, reflecting the strong feelings associated with the clashes and the archaeological park. A common factor in the discussions I held with the residents was that they felt that the space needs to be open and accessible to all, protected from potential privatisation and commercialisation. The archaeologists too insist that the park should be an open space, albeit with time restrictions, emphasising the need to protect antiquities from further vandalising. The archaeologists are also active in their own neighbourhoods, providing an interesting viewpoint on their distinction between their professional and personal capacities. This
reveals the hierarchies of value in terms of time, which consistently valorise the classical or ancient past in general. It is obvious that both parties share a very different kind of love and definition of what an archaeological site is, as well as a dissimilar sense of stewardship in regards to its protection. The problematic notion of stewardship as highlighted by Hamilakis (2007b: 28-19) emphasises the need for the protection of archaeological heritage to be a participatory and horizontal practice between archaeologies and communities.

At Plato’s Academy, the clashes occurring between state services has not been as confrontational as those witnessed at Philopappou Hill over the years. They have not dealt with immediate threats to restrict access to the park, like the former. They do however use the archaeological park as a platform for their diverse forms of protest frequently, and publicise their struggles through various social media platforms, leaflets and tri-monthly newspapers. Unlike the Philopappou Movement, the Committee of Plato’s Academy emphasises the historical significance of the park and its intention to promote it as an educational centre—directly associated with the use of the space in antiquity. Their interaction with and appropriation of the past has provided a platform through which they perceive themselves and also act and are mobilised. This implies a sense of an alternative form of ‘gentrification’, one that entails the adoption of the classical past and the desire to promote the park through its implementation in the national narrative in order to enable its revitalisation and by extension, the upgrading of the neighbourhood. However, they oppose the state’s facilitation of private plans to construct a mall which would employ the park’s “ancient prestige” as Anderson (2006) denotes, claiming that it is a way for the state to commercialise and exploit the past at the expense of the park’s historical value as well as the communities that reside in the area. As such, the residents of Plato’s Academy have been subjected to a different kind of exploitation compared to Philopappou, attesting to the gentrification of ‘degraded’ areas through neoliberal governance. These plans have thus prompted the residents’ mobilisations in their effort to resist the gentrification of their neighbourhood. Most importantly, they emphasise that there are more social issues involved in their mobilisations to protect the park due to the neighbourhood’s socio-economic structure and status. While both residential movements are striving to protect the parks and were fighting an uneven battle with state authorities, it became increasingly apparent to me that for the residents of Plato’s Academy, their urgent demands were not just a matter of their right to the city, but an actual matter of survival and integrity. The contrasting demographic composition of the two areas as discussed in Chapter 5 is a strong indicator of the degree of gentrification imposed upon the local communities, as well as the intensity of their effects. The significantly lower-income households of Plato’s Academy, the persisting higher unemployment and financial inactivity rates reveal the consistent and potentially additional degradation imposed upon the residents.

A final key point developed in this chapter is the sense of community created by the active movements in these neighbourhoods that is often very difficult to find in urban settings. The issues
that have brought them together have prompted them to form a team, almost a family, in order to find solutions. Their clashes against authorities, their feelings of injustice towards them, have heightened and motivated their sense of protection and stewardship towards their neighbourhoods and one another. Their absence in decision-making processes that concern their extended homes have fuelled their commitment to their causes and have further enhanced their interaction and awareness of their environments. More specifically and in regards to this study, the distance created by local and state authorities between communities and their right to decisions and changes in their areas, further adds to the distance between them and heritage.
Chapter 8  Performances of Identity

Figure 8.1 “Never mind the archaeolusts, what do we do now?”

This chapter examines the politics of identity existing in the spaces of interest. It does so by exploring the interplay between the national and the local, particularly through the eyes of residential activists. It seeks to discover whether the dynamics between the two layers of identity have affected the way in which the residents engage and identify with the archaeological spaces. The first two sections (8.1 and 8.2) investigate these dynamics through the practices of exclusion that the residents of Philopappou and Plato’s Academy feel they are subjected to by state services, the national/the official. This chapter further explores the multivocality and similarities existing within the local communities despite the internal differences and diversity. Overall, it aims to explain how these communities redefine the specific archaeological spaces and how their perceptions of a site differs from or coincides with official ones. The title of this chapter is borrowed from Goffman’s (1959) study on the performativity of self-presentation in everyday life, examining identity through self-definition and conceptualisation through social interactions with others. For the purposes of this study, the term is re-conceptualised in order to present the various ‘performances’ involved in the production of a deeper identification with the spaces of interest, in the contribution to the formation of a local identity, and in the perceptions attributed to the redefining of the spaces by local communities.
8.1 “Because the residents’ love is their [the hills’] best protection”

During my one and only participation in a film production, I was asked—ever so politely—along with the entire crew, to remove ourselves from… the landscape. Although the initial shoot was set to take place at the Andiros platform of Philopappou Hill facing the Parthenon (Figure 8.2), we were confronted by a guard working for the Ministry of Culture, informing us it was illegal to wear traditional clothing on archaeological sites. We insisted that the park is a public space and visitors should be able to creatively express themselves, however he instructed us to move to another location as we were “obstructing the tourists’ view of the hill from the Acropolis”.

The abrupt interruption of the filming of the segment “Stray Tsoliades” from director Christina Phoebe’s movie shoot for the film “i amigdalia”, offers a pertinent example of the distinction between archaeological heritage that plays a central role in the nation’s imagination, as opposed to heritage which firmly does not. Our contemporary dancing directly across from the Acropolis, according to the park’s guard, “obstructed” the tourists’ view of the city from the classical site. We were in many ways—albeit temporarily, and similarly to the Anafiotika settlement discussed in Chapter 3 and 4—‘polluting’ the tourists’ view and therefore had to be stopped.

![Figure 8.2 Stray Tsoliades obstructing the view of the city from the Sacred Rock. Photo Credit: Christina Phoebe and Yiannis Lascaris, 2017. Photo used with permission.](image)

See Appendix P for more pictures of our endeavours as everyday tsoliades on the hill.

Christina, an artist/performer/activist and good friend is in the process of completing her first performative documentary entitled Amygdaliá or “the almond tree”. The film explores what it means to be a foreign body today. It went into production in 2011 and is due for completion in 2018. One of the last shoots of the film took place in May 2017 on the hill. The scene’s code name was "stray tsoliades" (αδέσποτοι τσολιάδες), and made use of the traditional dress of the "tsolias", the historical infantry unit of the Greek Army.
Philopappou Hill’s close proximity to the Athenian Acropolis provides a dichotomy in which the relationship between the national and local elements are heightened. As previously mentioned in Chapter 4, the hill is part of a compound of three hills uniformly known as the Western Hills of the Acropolis. “West”, that is, of the Acropolis. This identification is directly linked to the location of the classical site, thus attributing a sense of centrality and focus to the Acropolis. This distinction of the Sacred Rock in relation to archaeological sites in the vicinity is a manifestation of the emphasis provided to classical heritage. The hills’ association and immediacy with the Acropolis has undoubtedly affected the way the Greek Archaeological Service has dealt with Philopappou Hill throughout the years, as discussed extensively in Chapter 4. The overpowering effect of the Acropolis is also reflected in the prices for renting and buying properties within the neighbourhoods encircling the Acropolis, especially those that have a view of the classical site (Trivoli 2009). It can further be seen in the areas’ popular accommodation demand among foreigners visiting the Greek capital. According to journalist Nikos Roussanoglou,

“Data further show that the closer a property is to the centre of Athens, the higher the going rate, especially if situated close to transport means such as bus stops or metro stations. Neighbourhoods such as Koukaki, Plaka, Thisio, Monastiraki, Makrygianni, Metaxourgeio and Kerameikos have observed such high demand that their rates on Airbnb have jumped in recent months.”62

(Roussanoglou 2017)

In my semi-structured interviews with residential activists, it was interesting to see the ways in which they expressed what I view as the discrepancy existing between the national and the local. It was a challenging task to identify the symbolic nexus of the two through our discussions but I soon realised that it seemed to emerge in conversations that were often not directly related to the matter. One such occasion was when Andreas told me that he thoroughly enjoys bringing friends from abroad to the hill and showing them around. He notes their surprise when discovering “another Athens; one that is not just about the fifth century BC”. He stresses that the failure of the UAAS Programme to create an “experiential symbiosis” between archaeological remnants and the modern urban environment is perhaps one of the main reason prominent classical sites such as the Acropolis have an overpowering effect on other sites. He connects his argument to the significance of the scattered archaeological sites located in the historic centre of Athens, dating back to a variety of periods, and stresses the importance of their integration to the UAAS Programme. He explains that these elements should be incorporated in a way that promotes all the historical periods from

Greece’s past in an engaging and experiential way. He believes that in order for this to be achieved, it is essential to establish critical institutional changes—“not only the construction of pathways [uniting spaces]”—which will gradually create a more sensorial, interactive and more powerful overall impact both for those that experience the historic centre daily, but also for those who visit it from abroad. He notes that the overwhelming attention given to the classical past, compared to the later periods leading up to the present, creates a disconnect between the past and the present. This distance also affects the way contemporary society perceives its position in the course of history, but also in the way the people relate to heritage.

“There is an emphasis on the classical period. To a certain point, it is understandable, that is to say—for me, the pinnacle [of Greek culture] is the Parthenon and the monuments of the Acropolis, their symbolism and everything associated with them. They are the pinnacle, but not to the extent that they should cast a shadow and erase almost everything else. That’s what it is. Because in that way, it removes us, the contemporaries, from history. History has no interruptions. Perhaps history may have been poorer in many respects even in regards to the production of culture or personalities—that period [classical] was unique, but we ought to see the whole of history. Otherwise, we won’t be able to understand ourselves in the present. How is it possible for you to understand yourself today as a product of a cohesive history from the past to the present, only through your contact with the fifth century, and feeling as if there was suddenly a leap [to the present] and the fifth century has re-emerged?”

(Andreas, personal communication, 18/12/2017)

While he recognises the cultural and historical value of the classical period, Andreas also acknowledges that its significance has been detrimental both to the city and its multitemporal materiality, and by extension to the citizens as well. Andreas views the fifth century as having “re-emerged”. I would suggest that it has always been present, defining the national narrative as an omnipresent backdrop upon which other historical periods have functioned as secondary features. This centrality on the classical past has dominated the existence of temporalities pertaining to other periods and has pushed aside the materialities that are connected with these. There is a discernible clash between monumental and social time as described by Herzfeld (1991) for the residents that live in close proximity to the Acropolis. Andreas accepts the monumentalisation attributed to the classical period, but is concerned with its effects on the present, social realities of the contemporary population.

As previously mentioned, the UAAS Programme’s ambitious goal to create a more direct approach to the city’s historical past, proved problematic primarily due to its overambitious nature and failure to provide a balance between the works and the urban/social fabric of the city. It imposed
changes on the city and further enabled the facilitation of privatisations and the sale of state property—including archaeological sites—giving way to the extensive decrease of public spaces and the justification for urban re-development at the expense of citizens. Philopappou Hill, a central ‘station’ to the Unification’s Programme, was one of the most intense examples of exclusionary practices in action. It prompted the events that led the residents to create a movement and to fight against the enclosure of the hill. In many ways, it intended to create a sense of cohesion and cultural continuity through the city’s ancient material traces whilst disregarding the local populations in the process—much like the process of nation-building and the consolidation of constituents through the selection of highly valued symbols as described by Gellner (1983: 55, 57).

The accumulation of selective cultural elements in order to establish a form of “high culture” continues to systematically dismiss local or “lower” forms of culture, ultimately creating an imbalance between the local and national nexus at the detriment of local communities. As Anderson (2006: 164-185), such practices aim for the creation of an “ancient prestige”, through the promotion of tangible remnants of the past. Moreover, the endeavour directly correlates to Herzfeld’s (2002) theory of crypto-colonialism, as the imposition of neoliberal policies and excessive urban reconfigurations in order to monumentalise segments of the city at the expense of its residents resembles the imperialistic and colonial practices of the past.

For Andreas, amongst the numerous outcomes of the Olympics preparations through the Unification Programme’s works, was the opportunity for individual archaeologists to fulfil personal ambitions:

“What I’ve seen is that there is the State Archaeology, which [is also linked to] various political connections and careers and all that— and there are people with all sorts of ambitions in there [...]”

(Andreas, personal communication, 18/12/2017)

A similar sentiment is expressed by Dimosthenis when he discusses the implementation of the fencing imposed on Philopappou Hill, proposing that this was another means of control and forceful ownership by the service, thus excluding the local communities, rendering them ‘unfit’ to safeguard the park and its antiquities:

“[...] there was no [official] funding for the fences. The fencing was their [the archaeologists’] decision. They wanted to confine the space. Why would they want to close it? Because that’s how they can control it. Control means we own it; we can open it whenever we want and we close it whenever we feel like it. We call the shots here. What I mean is, they wanted to change the nature of the space. Turn it into a [purely] archaeological site.”

(Dimosthenis, personal communication, 19/9/2015)
Both Andreas and Dimosthenis as well as other activists I have discussed with, view archaeologists as taking advantage of the authority and power that has been given to them. Once again, it is evident that the issue of ownership and stewardship is complex, revealing indirectly the ways in which residents also stake a claim in relation to these spaces and their operation. Moreover, the archaeologists’ efforts to monumentalise the space echo Gellner’s (1983: 57) discussion of a top-to-bottom frame imposed by the national upon the local, which in this case the local communities are trying to break. Opposing the space’s monumentalisation is a way to resist the loss of extra-official narratives and appropriations of Philopappou, those that are deemed non-significant in comparison to the superimposed national narrative. This is one of the many ways the residents have, in effect, redefined the nature of Philopappou, by reclaiming their right to interact in and with the space, beyond the control and officialised practices of the archaeological service.

An additional form of exclusionary practices through the accentuated attention to classical monuments and sites at the detriment of other, less prominent, non-classical sites—is an incident involving tree-pruning. As discussed in an assembly held by the Philopappou Movement, Konstantinos Tatsis—a local agronomist—argued that the archaeologists had not received professional training in regards to the way the trees needed to be tended, proceeding in pruning the trees during the wrong season. In a report composed for the environmental issues that plague the hill, the agronomist stated that one of the main concerns is that there has been a 30% loss of the hill’s flora for a variety of reasons (Report in Appendix Q). Amongst these, he noted that the environmental maintenance practices are insufficient, urging the Municipality of Athens to intervene as the official and legal owner of the park. He further emphasised that there has been extensive damage to the works of architect Dimitris Pikionis, reminding that these works are enlisted as a contemporary monument and work of art, which include the flora and extend all the way to a segment of the Acropolis Hill.

On the matter, Sophia and Andreas have argued that Pikionis was fully aware of the flora on the hill and its potential growth. As such, the two residential activists insist that contemporary archaeologists are unaware of the extent of Pikionis’s interventions and works to unite the classical monument with the Western Hills, with mutual respect to both the archaeological heritage and the environment, or they simply choose to disrespect the vision of an internationally acclaimed architect. Sophia’s and Andreas’s sentiment is present both through the movement’s blog, as well as the leaflets/posters disseminated in a protest to protect the great pine tree located in close proximity to the Loubmbardiaris Café created by Pikionis and the Byzantine church of St. Dimitrios Loubmbardiaris, whose renovations are a part of Pikionis’s greater interventions on the landscape. As seen on the leaflet below (see Figure 8.3), the movement claims that archaeologists:

“[…] [they] pruned the olive trees on Philopappou and the Acropolis. The olive trees are also a part of the flora, which is considered a declared monument. They [archaeologists] pruned them because they want to shorten all the trees so that the
Acropolis can be seen from all the points of Philopappou! Yes, we are not kidding, this is all documented.”

Figure 8.3 “NO to the cutting down of the great pine tree”. Leaflet by Philopappou Residents’ Movement 2016.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{63} For more information on the matters concerning the great pine tree on the courtyard of Sant Demetrios Loubardiaris, see the residents’ detailed post on their blog: https://filopappou.wordpress.com/page/3/. [Last Accessed: 08/12/2018].
I asked Sophia about the tree-pruning incident again when we met for a recorded interview. She informs me on the matter:

“[...] this was complete madness because it is impossible to do that [remove plants and trees from the Hill]; even if you want to do it, at some point you’ll reach the rear side of Philopappou Hill and [the Acropolis] won’t be visible anymore—what else is there to do, ‘shave off’ the hill? There are some hillocks here and there, but, even if you remove everything and the hill is left without any green— that’s how it was after the Greek War of Independence and because the shepherds would feed their goats there, right until the hill was relegated to the guardianship of various queens and noble women who grew trees and flowers— even if the hill was left without any greenery, there’d still be mounds. If you stand behind that mound [indicates], you can’t even see the Acropolis, I’m serious (laughter).”

(Sophia, personal communication, 25/7/2017)

Clearly, the attention provided to the Acropolis by the Service—one that is rooted in the fetishisation of the classical monument and its visibility (Yalouri 2001)—has made the residents feel that this comes at the detriment of the hills. The discussion leads us back to the tree-planting incidents discussed in the previous chapter. From their perspective, the residents feel that both the Municipality of Athens which is responsible for the parks’ environmental element, but also the archaeologists, were excluding them from a very important undertaking: the protection of the hill’s flora. Upon asking Sophia why she believes the archaeologists have proceeded in making such a decision, her response was very similar to the movement’s overall sentiment in regards to the particular action undertaken by the archaeologists:

“I think their [intention] — they wish to deprive the hill of the character of a park. Which was the very thing that defeated them— the hill’s natural attraction, I mean, its beauty as a park— they wish to gradually get rid of that. They don’t allow planting anywhere, do you understand? And it is a well-known fact that there are no remnants in the majority of the hill because it was bombed. They’ve become cement; they’ve become limestone since ancient times. The escarpment was an area that was dismantled by the ancient Greeks in order to build their own houses and that created the escarpment. It goes deep inside the ground, you know? Gradually, the furnaces [καμίνια] were put to use—I mean, I can remember furnaces operating on Philopappou. All this was buried later...”

(Sophia, personal communication, 25/7/2017)
Sophia’s view of the archaeologists’ plans echoes Dimosthenis’s sentiment in the way he perceives the service’s scheme to control the space and to alter its identity from an open park to a restricted archaeological site. The connection that she makes to previous uses of the hills indicates the multiplicity of uses of the space as well along with its material remnants, even before the establishment of the archaeological service in Greece. The way she links past appropriations to the space with the present—emphasising the hill’s character as a park above all else—shows that there is an emphasis on the space as a whole, beyond its cultural significance and uses in antiquity.

Presently, and despite the clashes that have taken place, residents still find ways to protect the hills plants, trees and bushes. They have selectively planted a variety of small trees on the northern part of the hill, and communicate with one another in order to create a rotational schedule for who will be responsible to water them during the week. In the summer of 2017, I had the opportunity to meet with Sophia on the hill on a number of occasions, to discuss matters that concern its protection whilst watering the trees that they had planted. We took long walks around the northern slope of the hill and observed their growth (or lack of) and I was shown the different techniques and devices applied by residents, used to water the different plants, trees and bushes. Whilst guiding me through the newly planted plants and trees, Sophia spoke about them with affection and was visibly excited when new flowers would appear on bushes or trees, or if one of the plants had managed to survive a rough patch. It was truly remarkable to see how much she cared for them, referring to each almost as if they were her own child. We took photographs to record their progress and I was given an elaborate session about the different types of care necessary for each type of plant (See Figures 8.4 and 8.5). The movements’ motto became apparent to me more than ever during our guerrilla water-planting sessions: “Because the residents’ love is their [the hills’] best protection.”

I offered to water the plants over the summer since I would be spending most of my time in the city, and I was told that perhaps there would be a possibility that I might have to do so myself. I felt like I was given a very important task and tried paying close attention to my personal guerrilla water-planting lessons so as to not make any mistakes when duty calls. Eventually I was told that there were enough people available to water the plants over the summer, and so my walks and tending to the ‘guerrilla’ plants were a way for Sophia and I to walk around the hill and catch up.

The heterotopias of difference which have been created due to the lack of inclusion has produced a space in which the residents create different forms of “lived moments” as suggested by Cenzatti (2008: 79). They have enabled for alternative appropriations, uses and control of spaces of representation (Harvey 1987: 266) which facilitate the formation of an organised and constructed space of ‘ritual’; the affection and care provided to the hill’s flora by the residents—despite the Service’s opposition—has developed a reconciliation mechanism to deal with the rupture resulting from the clash between the national and the local. Furthermore, the ‘ritualistic’ act of guerrilla water-planting and tending to the hill’s flora attributes powerful symbolisms and significations to the space. It is another form of reclamation of the space by the residents, a way to redefine the hill
through its natural and environmental features beyond its stagnant definition as an archaeological site. These activities and “lived moments” create a connection to the space which further contributes to breaking its ‘sanctified’ and monumentalised status.

Figure 8.4 Guerrilla plant-watering with Sophia (2017).

Figure 8.5 Discovering techniques to allow plants to grow on Philopappou Hill (2017).
Finally, a prime example of the interplay between the national and the local, the official and the extra-official, and the effects of exclusionary practices, can be observed in the movement’s infiltration of the hill’s narrative in cyberspace. Whilst looking through Wikipedia to discover the ways that Philopappou Hill and the monument are presented through the popular online encyclopedia, I discovered that there was an entry at the bottom of the monument’s description which referred to the movement (see Figure 8.6). The entry describes the creation of the movement in 2002 in an effort to “defend the natural character” of the space. The emphasis here has been attributed to the park’s natural environment, which supplements the many discussions with participants on the significance of the flora and fauna, the tree-planting endeavours, and the conflicts arising between activists and archaeologists. The entry further claims:

“For more than 10 years the residents of the neighbourhoods surrounding the Hill have challenged the plans of the Ministry of Culture to fence the entire 173 acres and restrict access by imposing visiting hours and an entrance fee. It is to this day the belief of the movement that the best protection for the hill is guaranteed by the love, care and active participation of the local people. As a result of their tenacity, the largest and most naturally beautiful public space in Athens remains free and open to all, day and night.”

(Description of the movement on Wikipedia’s entry on the Philopappou Monument 2017)

This particular description on Wikipedia could have been used in other segments of this thesis. I have chosen to discuss it here because it illustrates the efforts of the movement to have a presence that legitimises their existence and their actions. This stems from the lack of their effective inclusion by state services in decision-making processes which concern matters of the hills. This has in turn produced and augmented the relationship of difference between hegemonic structures and the movement, constructed through repeated modes of exclusion, much like Hall (1996) proposes. It has enabled the movement and its individual members to create a layer of identification rooted in the practices of exclusion they have dealt with throughout the years. Moreover, the above passage is also about affect, love and care; both archaeologist and activists evoke affect in the way they describe and mobilise for the hill, albeit in very different ways. The stark contrast between the affective ways the two parties perceive the space speaks to the way they define archaeological sites.
8.2 “Enough destruction”

“Enough destruction. There is another solution, promoting culture, including it in our daily lives, in our leisure walks, our group of friends. The Academy of Plato can reveal [our neighbourhood’s] history.”

(Motto of Plato’s Academy Residents’ Committee, 2016)

At a time of crisis, the word “destruction” takes on a plethora of meanings. It is used to describe the destruction of material and tangible things, but also that of abstract notions, ideas and values. It is during a time like this that some of the most sincere values and ideals emerge, both on an individual as well as on a collective level. Compared to the districts surrounding Philopappou Hill, the neighbourhoods near Plato’s Academy are distinctly less privileged. The area is densely populated, there is high unemployment rate and frequent inter-cultural tension, amongst others. Therefore, the word “destruction” does not solely refer to archaeological material remains, but also entails the gradual destruction of hope, the human spirit and basic rights. Luckily, the extended network of movements, assemblies, initiatives and committees actively deal with various “destructions” occurring in their neighbourhoods. In these endeavours, the archaeological park has acted as a space of hope (Harvey 2000), one that combines everyday activities, mobilisations, but also a core platform for the promotion of the area’s history, educational and cultural elements.

It seems that the park’s location in a low-income neighbourhood in many ways relates both to the types of activities that take place in the park, as well as the reasons people visit it more frequently.
As Ilianna characteristically put it in our first, unrecorded interview: “This is a very poor area with very poor people.” (Ilianna, personal communication, 13/9/2014). She explains that people cannot afford to spend money on outings and the park was/ has been the best alternative to spend time outside the house. This is a prominent reality in the Committee’s efforts to protect the park. The key word that reverberates in the material disseminated by the Committee is ‘degradation’. To a large extent, the residents feel that their neighbourhood has been intentionally degraded so as to give way to private and state neoliberal plans which will effectively exploit the area’s large industrial complexes, unused land plots, as well as the archaeological park for commercial purposes. The concept of a ‘degraded’ neighbourhood that needs to be ‘upgraded’ through commercial means has heightened the residents’ need to protect both their neighbourhood and in particular, the park. Simultaneously however, as Plato’s Academy and the surrounding districts are some of the areas most intently afflicted by the economic crisis, there is also a strong sense of futility. Therefore, in this case, exclusion takes the form of the degradation of the area and the failure to revitalise the park and provide more systematic attention and care to it.

The disproportionate ‘degradation’/‘upgrade’ debate and the intention to take advantage of the neighbourhood’s rich historical past for commercial interests and with the employment of blatantly neoliberal practices, intensifies a schism between the national, in this case plans of privatisation, and the local, which is represented by the bleak social conditions and prospects ahead. This stark reality is evident in a discussion about the residents’ involvement, or lack of, in the mobilisations against the construction of the Mall. In contrast to the neighbourhoods surrounding the Acropolis—in the case of Plato’s Academy’s—such priorities have to some extent shifted, giving way to more pertinent, everyday issues. As Ilianna informs me in our recorded interview:

“[Most factories and local shops] have already closed down. They have shut down due to the recession; because they had to pay too many taxes and because people don’t have money to go shopping, because megastores have opened [in the area] — because the opening times for stores have changed.64 [Most shops] have shut down; auto repair shops, clothing alteration shops—everything has shut down, everything. Small businesses are shutting down. They won’t be affected by the [construction of the] Mall because they have already been [destroyed] by the crisis.”

(Ilianna, personal communication, 25/7/2017)

64 The “split shift” model for working hours the majority of stores in Greece (as well as other Mediterranean countries) has been replaced by a continuous work schedule, predominantly implemented by retail chains. Ilianna believes that this change has affected the personal relations and labour rights of the working residents in the area.
Undoubtedly, the economic crisis has contributed to the emergence of a ‘bruised’ facet of the residents’ identity in this particular area, but it is interesting to note that their connection to the archaeological park goes beyond the harsh reality of their everyday lives. Through my personal interaction with the park, my observations and discussions, the park is seen as a place for cultural activities and expression, as well as a recreational space. This combination is primarily the way in which the residents of Plato’s Academy seek to define the space themselves. They feel that these educational resources and entities will contribute to the cultural character of the neighbourhood and further promote and ‘upgrade’ the archaeological site as well as the socioeconomic status of the area. Although it does not veer significantly from its official listing as an archaeological grove, the partial/minimal attention and funding provided for the space’s revitalisation by state services—as well as the imminent threat of commercialisation and gentrification—has prompted the residents to mobilise so as to be able to become actively involved in the decision-making processes which determine the fate of the space.

Mihalis is perhaps the park’s most prominent proponent advocating its historical importance. When I asked him how he views the ideal regeneration plan for the park and the neighbourhood, he responded:

“I cannot fathom of anyone conducting regeneration plans or plans of any sort here at the park or in the surrounding area, if they do not know the history [of the space]. Because this place is not a district park, a simple plain space, a beautiful park with nice flowers, trees and so forth. This place has a very long history. And that is exactly what everyone has to keep in mind so that they can determine how to make the best use of this space. It is not a case of some technicians or some scientists who are purely technocratic about how the region will be transformed because it has an identity, it is characteristic of this region and it is essential to make a conversation, not between the people about what will happen - but a dialectic conversation between the people and the history of this place. The history will determine what to do here and what not to do.”

(Mihalis, personal communication, 29/10/15)

Interestingly, Mihalis views the neighbourhood’s (and by extension, the country’s) history as cohesive and uninterrupted throughout time, leading up to the present day and including contemporary people’s interactions with and participation to that history. His views echo Andreas’s disappointment about the exclusion that the residents in Philopappou experience— Mihalis however offers a more inclusive intention for the future, insisting on the importance of collaboration between the state and the residents, which I think is indicative of the particular neighbourhood’s standpoint. Despite his hope for collaboration, Mihalis feels that there has been a form of exclusion which the neighbourhood has been subjected to; he feels that purely technocratic
and scientific approaches solely are not the way to promote the park’s history. He does however believe in the power of the Academy’s historicity—an imagined entity—is ultimately what will configure its place in history and by extension its location within the neighbourhood.

When I asked Mihalis how he feels about the works conducted by the archaeological service and whether he believes that there could be an active collaboration between the archaeologists and the residents of the neighbourhood, he responded that:

“I believe that archaeological research is not only a science that brings to light the ancient world, it is a science that must educate the world. It has to become a popular [λαϊκή] archaeology, that is, for the world to learn history ... I don’t want it to be enclosed in walls, I want to be able to go to the warehouses but I am not allowed to see those for which I have read [...] they do not let us. I believe when the new warehouse [on Ifigeneias Street] will open, it will only be accessible to researchers and archaeologists. Well then, I too will become a researcher! (laughs) [...] I often hear an archaeologist who conducts guided tours tell visitors ‘here, the area is degraded. It is full of Kurds, because it has not been revitalised and therefore there is no time to deal with such a situation—let’s discuss Plato’s philosophy’ But it’s not like that. So what, just because we are not in the city centre or near the Acropolis, or near Rigillis (cf. Aristotle’s Lyceum) [we do not deserve more attention?] Why?”

(Mihalis, personal communication, 29/10/15)

In a way, what Mihalis is hoping for is a type of archaeology for the people which will be open and accessible to the people. He doesn’t however necessarily view it as a practice which will function on a horizontal level between archaeologists and the public, but maintain a top-down approach which has always characterised the discipline. He trusts that the archaeological community could potentially impart its knowledge to the public by becoming more open, without physically building walls to exclude the citizens who are interested in the past.

Mihalis also makes an interesting allusion to the guided tours archaeologists conduct at the park. He feels that they are perpetuating the space’s and the neighbourhood’s view as degraded—going as far as referencing the presence of Kurds in a derogatory manner as proof of degradation. Nevertheless, in the midst of destruction, Plato’s philosophy emerges as a light in the darkness—reflecting perhaps the archaeologists’ emphasis on the past and dismissing the present, especially one that gets in the way of experiencing the past in its totality. Mihalis juxtaposes the archaeologists’ perception and presentation of the park as one that collides with the attention given to sites located more centrally in the city. The Acropolis here is used yet again as a point of reference, determining the cultural value and significance of other sites in regards to their proximity to the former. He feels that the Academy has not been given its rightful appreciation due to its distance to the beacon of Greek national identity. On the other hand, another school of
philosophy—Aristotle’s Lyceum [Lykeio Aristotelous], was aptly provided the necessary funding, attention and promotion from the state and the service, due to what he believes is owed to its prime location in an affluent district and closer to the city centre.

Nevertheless, Mihalis believes that the work archaeologists do is very important, and he personally does not feel he is in conflict with the service:

“I personally do not have a conflict with archaeologists. What archaeologists do is important. What they do however needs to be communicated to the residents, the need to inform the people […] I want the findings, the researches and the decisions made in the narrow circle of archaeologists to be accessible to everyone, for them to teach the people and to allow us to participate in the process—at least those of us who want to be informed.”

(Mihalis, personal communication, 29/10/15)

Yet again, his comments reflect a tone of reconciliation and acceptance. Apart from personal characteristics and personality traits, I cannot help but note that there is a clear difference in the way the residents in each of the two neighbourhoods experience (degrees of) ownership and stewardship and how these rate in relation to other issues burdening each resident on a personal level. As it turns out, there are a number of residents in the area that feel the same way as Mihalis. The historical significance of the space has become central in the way they view the future of the park. They feel that any plans to upgrade it as well as the neighbourhood should be done in respect to the historicity and archaeological importance of the space, in order to maintain its identity as an educational and cultural milestone.

The identification of the space as an educational centre, linking its original use as a school of thought in antiquity to the present—comes up frequently in conversation. On a guided tour of the contemporary history of the park by a member of the Committee, I was informed that the residents want the space to maintain its dual character of a park but also that of a research centre—a space of knowledge. Our guide explains that it would be the ideal location for scientists coming both from abroad as well as from Greece to conduct research both on the history of the site but also through activities that are philosophical in nature. The identity of the space as a centre of education has also made its way to the media through the Committee:

“The space within and outside the archaeological park should be promoted as a reference point for the production of culture and knowledge, as it was here that the first free university in the world from Plato, operated.”

(Karatziou 2013)
However, our guide also shares the same view as Mihalis—that the state and the archaeological service do not share the same vision. He claims that not only was the park not incorporated into the UAAS Programme, but it was not tended to in the same was as was Aristotle’s Lyceum. He insists that the Lyceum’s location overshadowed the Academy and was the main reason the archaeological service neglected the park and the efforts to rejuvenate it as initially planned. His thoughts on the matter echo the articles posted on the Committee’s blog regarding the discrepancy between the two schools of thought. Both he and the blog assert that the Lyceum’s upgraded neighbourhood is apparently where “the good Athenians” gather, where guided tours and other activities are described as an “urban institution” created by the apolitical social movement Atenistas—whereas these activities have been materialising at the Academy years before the opening of the Lyceum to the public (Residential Committee Blogspot 2014). The residents feel indignation by the lack of works initiated for the park’s promotion by state services, asserting that the Academy is just as important historically—if not more—than the Lyceum. They believe that the state prioritised funding directed to the Lyceum as it would rather promote an area which is more accessible both physically and aesthetically—ultimately meaning, that it is not located in a degraded neighbourhood. They view it as yet another way to undermine the neighbourhood and to strategically take advantage of its low socioeconomic status, so as to be able to justify commercial exploitation of the area. Mihalis’ view on the discrepancy between the Lyceum and the Academy accurately summarises how the residents feel about the matter:

“They [archaeologists] could have promoted the space [Academy]. But they chose another method [to approve the plan for the mall]. What was done at the Lyceum—that was the way to promote this space. And good for them. You go there [to the Lyceum], you see a space that is neat and taken care of with numerous informational panels on the north, the south, left and right. Good for them. Why didn’t they do that here? Why follow the other path? Nothing sufficient has happened here since 1963 [...]”

(Mihalis, personal communication, 29/10/15)

---
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It is clear to me that, despite good intentions for inclusivity and joined collaboration, the painful sentiment of abandonment and exclusion is a recurring theme in the discussion with members of the particular neighborhood. In addition to a burdening financial distress, the residents also witness disheartening demoting practices that reflect a preferential system that is clearly against them.

When I asked Alexandros about his thoughts in regards to how he feels about the failure of the park’s inclusion to the UAAS programme, his response was:

“It would have been nice if the unification [UAAS] had occurred. There could have been a bicycle path to get from here to the Acropolis, it would be very nice... That would make it harder to plan the construction of a mall... [Then] you would not say this is a degraded area, because it would certainly be different. You could ride [your bicycle] from here, or someone could ride theirs from the Acropolis to come here, and so [the space] could not be used for the Academy Gardens, it could not be done.”

(Alexandros, personal communication, 3/8/17)

Alexandros also believes that the extension of the unification plans to the park would have potentially deterred the plan to construct the mall. He feels that the area would have received a more organic form of ‘upgrading’ which would not entail the commercial exploitation of the park. Most interestingly, he creates a link between the Acropolis and the Academy, both physically and symbolically. Perhaps the connection between the classical site and the park would provide an additional cultural value to the latter, therefore obstructing any chance of the neighbourhood’s urban reconfiguration through privatisation materialising. I ask him how he views the future of the park, to which he responded:

“The space could be a combination of an archaeological site and a park as it has been for so many years. There was no problem, nor for the antiquities that exist here. However, there could be an institution here to deal with the park. We are familiar with the Municipality, we know how it works (irony)... but they want to degrade [the area]. They don’t deal with the lighting or the plant-watering ... The space could be self-managed and operate as an archaeological space that tourists could visit, and in some way the area's shops would have some benefit from [the site]. There could be a canteen inside in the park managed by the Committee so that they can make a profit which could go towards the park’s maintenance. That would be ideal.”

(Alexandros, personal communication, 3/8/17)
Again, there is disappointment and a clear sentiment of injustice. Alexandros states that being excluded from any decision-making process is not only unfair and pointless but also actively undermines the area and any prospect for actual improvement of the area. His personal experiences growing up at the park—his house bordering the space and his memories of playing amongst the ancient remnants—is perhaps the reason he believes in the coexistence between the materiality of the space and the multiplicity of its present uses. His idea for the space to be self-managed could be an indication both of his young age (he is in his mid-thirties) as well as his political convictions. More importantly, it denotes a personal sense of stewardship towards the park that he has grown up in as well as a sense of ownership; a self-sustained space controlled by the residents which could potentially promote and provide it the attention it truly deserves.

Mihalis’ views on the future of the park also attests to its existing liveliness and his desire to maintain its vivacity in the years to come:

“There should [continue to be] be playgrounds, sports courts, there should be a museum [the Museum of the City of Athens]; the space should be alive. It should be a living space as it was then when it gathered the young people and held all sorts of events. A few years ago, nothing was happening here. There was no Cooperative Café, nor Politeia or the Steki. And nothing was ever happening. [People were] afraid—there was a darkness in the area. It was selective residents that brought the light you see here today. Of course, the crisis contributed to this direction as well.”

(Mihalis, personal communication, 29/10/15)

His words come into direct opposition to official narratives in regards to who brought the ‘light’ to the park (Chapter 4). For Mihalis, it was the residents and their collective efforts through the Committee, the educational centre Politeia and the Café that came together and diminished the existing darkness in the area. He does however attribute the gradual increase of contact with the space with the crisis, which brought more people out to the park as an alternative to costly outings. Of course, the joined determination to make the park more approachable and open to the residents can be considered a consequence of the crisis, fuelling active citizens to produce a better environment for themselves during critical times. However, in my view, it was one that was reinforced by perhaps an existing sense of solidarity and of community which was prevalent due to the neighbourhood’s low socioeconomic status.

The consistent practices of exclusion the residents of Plato’s Academy are subjected to, are perhaps best expressed in their entirety through the material produced by the Residents’ Committee. A common theme—beyond the importance of the space’s history—is the exclusion from decision-making processes which affect the archaeological park and effectively their interaction and appropriation of it.
“We want the history of our neighbourhood back! We don’t ask for much: we ask for our story and our future for our neighbourhood! We want the area’s history, not its deterioration! We associate our struggle for open spaces in the neighbourhoods of the centre of Athens with the historicity of our historical area; we demand the improvement of Plato’s Academy’s park. We won’t give an inch of free land to the [capitalist] interests that want to bury history [and] our memory. Our strength is that in this neighbourhood we are still able to see the Attic sky. [...] we have a lot to do, to say and to plan. This concerns our lives and our children’s future.”

(Plato’s Academy Residential Committee Blogspot 2017)

The word that stands out the most in this declaration is “we”. It represents the ‘internal’ identification—much like Jenkins proposes (2008)—which has been created within the community through their similarities and common objectives for the park. This sense of identity clearly is in opposition to “them”—those who seek to overshadow their place in history, their neighbourhood, and the future of the park—creating thus a relationship of difference with state authorities and particularly their enablement for private exploitations of the neighbourhood. The above quote encompasses the past, the present and the future, providing a temporal and affective amalgamation of ambitions, hopes, failures and political rhetoric, as Knight (2012; 2015) asserts occurs at times of crisis.

8.3 Multivocality as Similarity

In a conversation with Sophia about the first assembly ever held, she tells me how the removal of the fencing not only contributed to the official founding of the neighbourhood’s movement, but to the formation of a ‘family’. She tells me that despite the political differences among members that were present and the internal disagreements that ensued between them in the months and years that followed—much like a family—they were always there for each other when things got worse. They were present at each other’s court trials—not just as witnesses but also for support—as well as during times of personal joy and of sadness.

Much like a functional family that is able to incorporate and carry multiple voices and stances, the movement was always diverse in its composition. Sophia informs me:
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“The movement is diverse, politically. Some leftists initiated it; Trotskyists that wanted to ‘bring’ the Zapatistas’ revolutions to Greece. They were looking for a cause. The fencing provided them with a cause, not so much for the reclamation of the Hill, but the transference of the [Zapatistas] model. They wanted to ‘play this game’ two-three times and then move on, transfer the model elsewhere. Additionally, there was a group anarchists in the mix that although were not interested in the Zapatistas model, they felt that the Hills was their ‘back garden’, a public space which they wanted to claim against the authorities. And of course there were ‘units’ [individuals] involved, like myself, Andreas, Laura, and Dimosthenis—we just wanted to enjoy the park. But we were units; we weren’t in any politically motivated group. The units had a more organised political thought I believe, because at the end of the day, we were the ones that convinced the local community […] tried to institutionalise our actions because here [on the Hill], there were specific issues that needed to be dealt with. It wasn’t our concern to apply a revolutionary model […] we wanted to take care of the Hill.”

(Sophia, personal communication, 13/11/2015)

Perhaps one of the finest examples of the multivocality existing between the movements active in their reclamations of Philopappou Hill, was the creative form of protest the Resident’s Movement prepared in order to welcome the mayor to the Hill, on Clean Monday (27/2/2017). Dressed as investors (myself included!) we urged visitors to “seize the opportunity” offered by Mr. Kaminis and purchase a segment of the hill as other private investors will potentially be able to, if the he remains inactive. Apart from the prominent banners hanging on visible locations near the main entrance of the hill, the movement distributed an open letter to the mayor (see Appendix L), prompting him to abide to the minimal legal processes necessary to ensure that a part of the hill will remain open to the public and not fall into private ownership. The use of language and extensive references to legal processes shows the time and effort dedicated by the movement in deciphering legal documents and technicalities, which would most likely remain unnoticed to the ‘untrained eye’.

Supporting the cause on the same day was the Open Residents’ Assembly of the Petralona, Thiseio and Koukaki neighbourhoods. These areas are located on the western side of the hill and, along with the Anarchist Collective Antipnoia, prepared a leaflet condemning further commercial exploitation of the park. Compared to the Philopappou Residents’ Movement, it is evident that both the Open Residents’ Assembly and the Anarchist Collective employ a far more politically charged stance in opposition to the state and the current political system. The use of language utilised in both banners and leaflets distributed on the day, focus not only on the issues relating to the park, but to the broader struggles concerning the lack of public spaces and the exploitation of these by an unjust and corrupt capitalist system.
Particularly telling about the multivocality in the area, however, is the coexistence of different approaches employed by the various movements active in the area, which can also be seen through the use of colours on their respective banners. The Philopappou Movement mainly uses green and red whereas the Open Assembly (see Figure 8.7) and Antipnoia (Figure 8.8) use primarily black to get their message across. Again, these colours are indicative of the political stance of each movement, but also representative of the re-appropriations of the archaeological space in the present. Through my field work, I have discovered that despite the similarities in the personal and individual leisurely uses of the archaeological site by activists in their everyday lives, when mobilised in collective action, it is obvious that their respective approaches are geared to a great extent by their political convictions and values.
Figure 8.7 “INVESTORS HURRY: THE MAYOR IS GIVING AWAY LAND PLOTS AT DIONYSUS ON PHILOPAPPOU”. The word “investors” has been modified to create a word play to one that ‘rips’ someone off. On the right: “HANDS OFF PHILOPAPPOU” (2017).

Figure 8.8 “NO to the PRIVATISATION OF PUBLIC SPACES”. Antipnoia Anarchist Collective (2017).
Nevertheless, this is not necessarily problematic. In an assembly following the Clean Monday Protest, these three movements discussed future forms of protest in order to protect the hill’s land from being sold. The call to action was initiated by the Philopappou Movement, and principally focused on the crucial legal actions needed in order to prevent this from happening. In the course of the discussion, activists and concerned residents provided support for upcoming protests and legal arrangements to be undertaken, as well as ideas to further the cause. Members of the Open Residents’ Movement and from Antipnoia argued that legal pathways are almost never effective, and prompted all those present to participate in an impromptu occupation of the Dionysus parking space. Confusion ensued, however the discussion was quickly coordinated and the main ideas and upcoming calls to action were successfully recapitulated, before everyone proceeding to protest against the restaurant’s illegal occupation of the hill and the potential sale of the surrounding space to private interests.

![Impromptu occupation/protest at Dionysus carpark (2017).](image)

The case for Plato’s Academy is somewhat different. As previously discussed in Chapter 7, the Residential Committee confronts a number of issues that are not directly related to the park. They are consistently fighting to protect residents’ rights against injustices such as property repossessions and their inability to cope with rising taxes and utility costs amongst other matters. On the contrary, the Philopappou Movement primarily channels most of its energy to mobilising for matters concerning the protection of the hill—an indication perhaps of the contrasting socioeconomic statuses of the two neighbourhoods. I believe that it is the plethora of dire issues
that need to be dealt with which have created a more complex relationship between members of the Residential Committee, as Mihalis explains below. He views the Committee’s mobilisation as essential in the neighbourhood—despite mistakes that have been made in the past—acknowledging the effort and personal investment provided by individual members to the causes plaguing the area:

“When you take action, you make mistakes, and through the mistakes, there are also conflicts that arise and that is why sometimes acceptance of mobilisation/activities might not always be smooth. It is a known fact that the people in the Committee are active citizens, that is, they are not ‘sofa-activists’, they participate in the commons, they care. And most of them are involved in other actions. The fact that SYRIZA came to power—through which several members in the Committee are also actively a part of—and they cannot do anything at the moment, does not mean that these citizens will not do something. Or, if the neighbourhood’s interests are against government policy that does not necessarily mean that they [the Committee members involved in SYRIZA] will do what the government says [...]”

(Mihalis, personal communication, 29/10/15)

The political element is heightened in the way Mihalis views the Committee’s formation, which in many ways resembles the intermix present in the Philopappou Movement. The latter however, as described by Sophia, includes members that are not driven by political beliefs or partisanship (the units), which in her view are the ones that have a clearer vision of the legal procedures necessary to protect the hill. Mihalis notes too that despite a number of Committee members’ association with the governing SYRIZA party, they prioritise the well-being of the neighbourhood over party lines or inactivity. Nevertheless, he adds:

“The negative thing is that some people look at the Committee as a political platform, and they often make an entire political speech [propaganda] before they discuss any relevant issues.”

(Mihalis, personal communication, 29/10/15)

His next few words following the above discussion perhaps foreshadowed Mihalis’ departure from the Residential Committee, for which he informed me about the last time I saw him (19/12/17). Even though he feels that there are more differences than similarities within the Committee, he still believes that the residents unite to protect the park and the neighbourhood, attributing the importance of the space as one that fuels action and by extension, a sense of similarity amongst the relationships of difference amongst residents:
“I see things slightly differently. I believe that the Residential Committee should deal with other issues [...] it should focus more on the area with the local problems and be able to unite the residents, whether they are [politically] right or left, greens, reds, what have you - except for fascists of course [...] There are always problems and conflicts, but there is always action. The neighbourhood, these actions and the rejuvenation of this area unite us.”

(Mihalis, personal communication, 19/12/17)

Mihalis’ observation brings me to an outsider’s perspective—that of Ilianna’s—who, despite the fact that she is not a member of the Residential Committee of Plato’s Academy—is actively involved in a solidarity group located in the neighbourhood. When I asked her about her thoughts on the Residential Committee as an outsider and its resonance in the neighbourhood, she tells me that although there have been significant steps taken by the Committee and other movements in their effort to halt the construction of the Mall, they lack a cohesive political direction:

“I believe that there is no unilateral axis—everything needs to be dealt with in its totality, with a cohesive policy. Everything. And the first concern should always be people and the conditions in which they live and work. If you can’t see that and develop everything around that concept, you will always be heading towards the wrong direction. And you’ll lose it. Of course all of this [the archaeological park] must be the property of the resident’s claims. Those that live here, and not just the ones that come from other areas and protest or participate in an organised activity or event [against the mall]. This belongs to the residents that live here. They are the ones that experience it 24 hours a day. Yes, ok, generally there have been efforts [to protect the space]. But they were not large in scope. If they were, things would be different.”

(Ilianna, personal communication, 25/7/2017)

Ilianna stresses the need to address people’s living and working conditions as a core matter through which to mobilise and protect the neighbourhood. She focuses on the people’s well-being first and infers that the protection of the park will come organically if the attention is shifted to the general, basic rights that people need in order to be able to achieve a higher quality of life.

8.4 Concluding Thoughts

The consistent practices of exclusion to which the Philopappou residents feel they are subjected to by state services, is to a great extent attributed to the dominance of the classical past and its effect on the hill. The close proximity of the space to the Acropolis has imposed the monumentalisation attributed to the classical site, and in many ways ‘disturbs’ the social time of the hill. Despite being
open to the public and serving as an archaeological site and a recreational park, Philopappou is frequently subjected to forms of monumentalisation, leaving residents to feel indignation or “left out” of the weave of history. The UAAS has contributed to this process too, attempting to debilitate the recreational character of the space in an effort to create cultural continuity through the city’s ancient monuments and sites. The programme’s crypto-colonialist practices came at the expense of the local population, further widening the gap between archaeology and the public. These systematic forms of exclusion have greatly contributed to the residents’ identification with Philopappou, strengthening both their relationship with the space, as well as contributing to the formation of a local sense of identity. Their persistent efforts to oppose the space’s monumentalisation, to maintain extra-official forms of contact and interaction with the space, to be included in decision-making processes that affect the hill, but also the ability to officially be a part to its protection, have solidified the connection felt by residents with Philopappou. By reclaiming their right to the space, the residents have redefined Philopappou Hill beyond its official status as an ‘archaeological site’, and in a very contrasting manner to the way it is perceived and present by official state mediums.

Similarly, the residents of Plato’s Academy also feel that they have been excluded from history, albeit from a very different perspective. As opposed to the Philopappou residents, the local community of Plato’s Academy—to a great extent—feels that the archaeological park has not been promoted as an important milestone in the national, official, narrative. They perceive the space as one of immense historical and educational significance, which could ultimately function both as a recreational park but also as a research centre—forming a link to its use as school of thought in antiquity. It is evident that the residents desire to adopt the classical past and thus be a prominent part of the national narrative, whilst simultaneously protecting the space’s social time and the everyday activities which have enabled the park’s further integration into the community. The space acts both as a locus through which the area should be revitalised but also as a platform for the residents’ resistance to the area’s degradation and exploitation. These factors contribute to the community’s strong identification with the archaeological space and further enable the formation of a local identity.

The intricate multivocality existing in the two areas functions both as an element of dissonance between members of movements but also as a means of identification. Political convictions, ideologies and plans of actions have often become a point of contestation amongst the residents mobilising for the protection of the archaeological parks. However, what has become increasingly apparent to me throughout the years is that it is through the fruitful diversity and multiplicity that residents become more empowered in their efforts. Their points of diversion often fuel the need to maintain horizontal practices amongst movements, creating a stronger collective dynamic which ultimately enables them to actively protect the spaces of interest. This is further boosted by the
need to unite against a hegemonic ‘enemy’—one that is considered a greater threat and requires unity in order to fight against.

Overall, the discrepancy between an overarching national identity and the fluidity of local identity becomes clear, as the unique engagements and interactions with archaeological parks have palpably fostered a sense of identity amongst local communities that is different from the one imposed by official narratives. The claimed and constructed sense of identity of the residents, which is to a large extent directly linked with their surroundings, creates a sense of belonging and reinforces their identification with place. A strong sense of local identity is evident in both neighbourhoods, which can be seen through the residents’ involvement in various actions and interventions, but also in their tangible relationship with the actual, physical place; the latter is evident in their physical interaction with each park, their personal recollections as well as their individual and collective memories. The interplay between the national and the local manifested through exclusionary archaeological practices, has hindered an effective relationship between archaeology and the public, creating a gap which has yet to be fully reconciled.
Chapter 9  Conclusion

“What else is there to find?”

I thought it would be fitting to start this reflection by going back to one of the many reactions I received when, as a young adult, I informed friends and family that I would be studying archaeology. One of the few things that hasn’t changed from the initial versions of my introductory chapter, is the belief that I was indeed embarking on a journey to “find out” more but also to re-discover the intricacies of the city I grew up in from a very different perspective.

The threefold aim of this study was to explore the modern cultural biographies of Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy; to contribute to the re-evaluation and decolonisation of archaeological practice by emphasising the urgency for inclusive decision-making processes and collaboration between archaeological and local communities; and, finally, to highlight the significance of the right to the city through the residential activism associated with the reclamation of archaeological sites. The thematic triad employed as an analytical tool paved the way for the investigation of the research questions. As such, these questions intended to identify and reveal the multitemporality and materiality of the spaces, the acts of contestation between local communities and state services and private endeavours; as well as the multifaceted performances of identity associated with the residents’ engagement with and perception of the parks.

Throughout my research, it became evident that there was never a clear, defining line between these themes as they constantly intertwined and overlapped. Therefore, employing a qualitative methodology was the best way to begin to understand the significance of these intersecting analytical ‘portals’, while also examining in depth the participants’ connection to the spaces, their social interactions, their memories and experiences, as well as the meanings and significations they have attributed to the archaeological sites. In time however, I came to realise that, in fact, the most important question of this research was how the communities redefine the specific archaeological sites, and whether their perception of what a site is differs from the official one. I have arrived at this particular question as a focal point as it encapsulates the subquestions set in the beginning of this thesis while also providing a foundation through which the results of this study can be better understood.

The key chronological timemarks introduced in Chapter 1 and discussed in further detail in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 provided the research background, further facilitating the exploration of theoretical concepts for this study. How have the epistemological and ontological foundations of the Greek archaeological service affected modern local societies and their engagements with archaeological sites? What were the consequences of the preparations of the Athens 2004 Olympic Games on the urban geography of the city? And how did the intensification of urban mobilisation, since the
commencement of the economic crisis, contribute to the causes of the local communities studied in this research?

Originally, I had placed most of the emphasis of the research background on the ‘ghost of archaeology past’. In hindsight, it was too early for me to start making some of the connections that I was able to make over time. In particular, the link between the increase of residential movements after the Syntagma Square Occupation in 2011 was a crucial one (I initiated this research in March 2012), as it boosted mobilising tactics and emerging practices of urban commoning (Stavrides 2014), significantly changing residential activism in the city. As for the aftermath of the Athens 2004 Olympics, I was familiar with the shift experienced in a number of neighbourhoods, but I was unaware of the extent of the effects. Re-discovering the city through urban geography studies opened my eyes to a whole new reality which at the time I had caught glimpses of, but had never been able to put into words. From then on, every outing, every ride through a different neighbourhood became a lookout for the alterations that I had previously missed. The pieces of the puzzle slowly started coming together, until eventually I was able to make an association between the three chronological timemarks in a way that I felt was interconnected and organic.

Once I had established these key events as a timeframe for my study, it was difficult not to find parallels between the more recent past and the present. The centrality of the classical period—deeply embedded in archaeological practices—still hovers over the way heritage is managed in the present, but also the perception of how it should be managed. The monumentalisation of the Anafiotika community (Caftanzoglou 2001) bares close resemblances to the one imposed on Philopappou Hill, as the residents feel as if they are being written out of history due to the area’s proximity to the Acropolis. Contrastingly, the community of Plato’s Academy feels that the historical—classical—significance of the archaeological site should be adopted into the national narrative more prominently, in order to receive the attention that they feel it rightfully deserves. The differing perceptions of the two spaces by local communities are fuelled by the narratives and historical contingencies formed through the concurrent development of the nation-state and the archaeological service in the mid-nineteenth century. In turn, it has affected the way residents reappropriate and identify with the sites, and the way they experience the spaces’ temporality and materiality.

This is further evident in the implementation of the UAAS mega-project and its aim to display the city’s historical continuity despite the large-scale reconfigurations to the urban fabric. Being another example of the crypto-colonialist practices of the archaeological service, it was experienced quite differently by the two communities. In the case of Philopappou, the works conducted by archaeologists for the programme seemed to rather disorient the residents as it felt more like a ‘break’ imposed upon the park’s social time and the way the residents perceived the space. While the community has always been aware of the material traces and their origin to different periods, this enforced compartmentalisation was altering the multitemporality the
residents had experienced at the site for so long. The co-existence of the multiple strands of time within the space were suddenly being prominently separated into different categories, whilst the Pnyx was fenced and isolated due to its connection to the classical past. A decisive factor to the site continuing, to this day, to offer a space for recreational activities—despite the demarcation and partitioning imposed by the service—was, in my opinion, Pikionis’s architectural and environmental interventions. The archaeologists’ emphasis on monumentalising and fragmenting the hills has seemingly shifted the residents’ focus on an element of the space which enhances its unity rather than its separation. Pikionis’s work enabled for a harmonious link amongst the varying periods represented at the hills, without however monumentalising one historical period over another. After all, his interventions’ subtle existence throughout the park, at times bolder and others more subtle, managed to encapsulate modern architectural movements of the time they were created, combined with “ongoing dialogues between the ancient, the popular, the Byzantine, and the neoclassical” (Loukaki 1997: 322). Over time, I came to see why the residents were more concerned with the environmental and architectural features of the space: it was those elements that maintained and enriched the social life of the space as opposed to the monumentality imposed upon it by archaeologists.

The residents of Plato’s Academy experienced the effects of the UAAS programme very differently. Initially, I was surprised that they felt indignation for the failure of the plan to include the archaeological grove, as I had associated the mobilisation of the Residents’ Committee with struggles against commercial exploitation and gentrification; their desire for Plato’s Academy to be a part of the programme clashed directly with this image in my mind. However, as my research progressed I came to see that the need to be included into the historicity of the city was more important than the potential urban reconfigurations that would have been implemented. Even more unexpectedly, this sentiment was shared by participants of varying ages and political convictions. Alexandros, whose family home was being expropriated by the state in order to extend the boundaries of the archaeological space, was the one who pointed me to the fact that the UAAS—beyond its implications on promoting the historical importance of the space—was seen as a way to deter more aggressive privatisation plans. The cultural and heritage-oriented aims of the UAAS were therefore viewed as an asset and a way to safeguard and promote the space. While writing this conclusion, the construction of the mega-mall Academy Gardens is still endangering the neighbourhood of Plato’s Academy. The most prominent issue—beyond the inevitable closure of hundreds of small business—is the safeguarding of the archaeological park. It is a central matter discussed in every platform, and more people have become aware of the situation burdening local residents. The paradigm of Plato’s Academy does not cease to present the necessity of processes of inclusion in the management of heritage, and the urgent need to re-assess the impact of neoliberal governance in cases involving archaeological spaces.
Despite the different perceptions of the archaeological spaces, the chief similarity between the two communities is their persistence and determination to protect the sites and to promote them in the ways that they feel are best. Their dedication and investment to these causes not only demonstrates the need for the application of inclusionary practices, but also contributes to the cultural biography and multitemporality of the spaces. Most importantly, it is inconceivable to think about the future of these sites, without keeping in mind the communities’ role in events that have occurred in the last fifteen years as these events represent the modern uses and appropriations of the spaces and the determination of local communities coming together, despite their political and social differences. Therefore, going back to the key question of this research—these communities have redefined these archaeological sites on two levels; first, by reclaiming the right to be a part of the spaces’ lives and narratives and second, by their practical uses, appropriations, and incorporation into their everyday activities.

The vivacity of Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy in the present are unfortunately very likely to be lost in time. They too might be deemed of ‘lesser’ value, not powerful enough to provide an additional seed in the perpetual negotiation and consolidation of national identity. Nevertheless, the exclusion communities have been systematically subjected to, combined with the social relationships created within, have contributed to the strengthening both of their identification with the respective spaces, but also with one another. It has ultimately prompted them to create stronger bonds with individuals fighting for the same cause, but also to formulate a heightened sense of stewardship in regards to the archaeological parks—one beyond its conceptual link to colonial and national tendencies (Hamilakis 2007b: 28-29).

Residential activism associated with archaeological sites has shown that there is a dire need to further integrate these spaces into the greater urban environment. It is also indicative of the need to create more horizontal and inclusive practices, and the necessity of a public archaeology that involves communities without dismissing their contribution to the production of spaces, their preservation and their part in their ongoing history. This research has demonstrated the extent to which the reclamations of these spaces by communities highlights the need for the archaeological community to engage more actively in decolonising the discipline and its hegemonic, authoritative status; as such, it would enable a re-evaluation of the archaeology, its relationship with the public, as well as the cultural value of present interactions existing between communities and archaeological sites. Most importantly, it has shown that in a city overwhelmed and burdened with neoliberal governance that have sufficiently decreased the amount of available spaces to the public, the issue of fragmented and enclosed archaeological sites perpetuates the lack of open spaces. In terms of reclaiming the right to the city, the mobilisation of these communities proves that these spaces have played an important role within this context, as through their relationship with spaces, people have created a ‘break’ in the hegemonic bounds that freeze archaeological sites in time and render them heterotopias.
In the last thirty years there have been substantial efforts around the world in order to reconcile the gap created between archaeology and the public. Archaeologies ‘from below’ have successfully proven that horizontal collaborations with diverse publics and communities accentuate heritage studies and management, and continue to provide new and fruitful approaches. Faulkner’s work (2002) demonstrates how the active participation of communities in archaeological endeavours enriches our knowledge ‘database’ and simultaneously contributes to more democratic modes of discovering the past. It further shows that minimising hierarchies on site and in decision-making procedures, whilst also accepting that there is no one single method in research (ibid. 32), are key to enabling the production of active and dialectical participation in the formation of cultural biographies of sites, as well as inclusionary decisions on spaces that are a part of communities’ every day realities.

In order to build collaborative platforms and facilitate the creation of new knowledge, it is essential to accept that archaeological practice is inherently political and needs to be confronted (McGuire 2008: 10-11, 14-50). Political praxis in archaeology entails acknowledging the idea that information and interpretations generated through archaeological practices formulate values that cannot be neutral, often leading to conflicting interrelationships amongst communities, the public more broadly, and hegemonic structures (cf. Zimmerman and Little 2010: 134). Public archaeology has paved the way for a more activist form of archaeology which identifies the concerns and complex implications that arise when dealing with archaeological heritage. Stottman (2010: 3) suggests that activist archaeology is indeed rooted in public archaeology, proposing that it can “consciously be used to benefit contemporary communities and perhaps create positive change or help solve modern problems”. Both McGuire (2008) and Stottman (2010) advocate for an activist archaeology which will confront social injustices pertaining to uneven power relations which ultimately silence and exclude a number of social groups located at the heart of every society, one that brings to the fore the multitude of existing narratives through the prisms of class, gender, sexuality, race, and ethnicity (cf. McGuire 2008: 37). A notable case-study accentuating the importance of such participatory practices is presented through the community archaeology project at Red Hill Camp in Canberra, Australia (Skitmore et al. 2019). It focuses on the recent history of the modern city through the voices of urban Indigenous communities—a collaboration with Canberra’s Ngambri, Ngunnawal and Ngunawal Representative Aboriginal Organisations— and explores the varying interpretations associated with Red Hill Camp, the processes of place-making and the reclamation of contested spaces through “conflicting narratives” (ibid. 107). This study showcases that even within the most complex of settings involving historically marginalised groups with differing types of engagements and interpretations of space within the urban palimpsest, active forms of archaeology can promote and bring to light “histories of oppression and exclusion in city landscapes, and contribute to an anti-colonial push against dominant narratives of the colonial past” (ibid.). Furthermore, Atalay’s community-based participatory work in Çatalhöyük (2006; 2007; 2010) is a prime example of sustainable archaeological practices and efforts to democratise
knowledge. Her work shows the significance of local knowledge—from the ‘credible knowers’—
and the need to make archaeology relevant to the communities that live in close proximity to
archaeological sites or whose heritage is being studied despite the often slow progression and
challenging nature of the endeavour (2010: 427).

The effort to create more democratic models and collaborative practices through public and
community archaeology in an increasingly globalising world that effectively overshadows the
needs of communities and diverse social groups, often proves to be a difficult undertaking.
Nevertheless, it is because of the rapidly neoliberalising politics that these forms of archaeological
practices are deemed necessary. Mega-projects imposed in various urban and rural environments
such as the ones developed in Turkey (Apaydin 2016) have proved that local issues can escalate to
a national scale and even take people’s lives—as witnessed in the case of Gezi Park. Moreover,
privatisation of public spaces such as Park Güell in Barcelona (Plataforma Defensem el Park Güell
2012), as well as the gentrification and commercialisation of historic districts at the expense of
local residents such as the case of Monti in Rome (Herzfeld 2009), continue to present the negative
effects of neoliberal economics and the resulting injustices that arise. It is therefore integral to
actively re-evaluate archaeological practices and make them applicable in the fast-pacing social,
political, and economic changes we are witnessing today.

In Greece, there have been a number of significant steps in order to bridge the chasm between the
public and the archaeology. Scholarly/academic as well as private ventures have set a productive
platform between archaeology and the people—particularly on a theoretical level, due to
obstruction by state regulations and policies—in which the reconsideration of archaeological
practices and the re-evaluation of the relationship between the discipline and the public are
occurring. Nevertheless, despite the fact that there has been an attempt to “connect the dots”
(Stroulia and Buck Sutton 2009) between archaeology and the public, there is still a long way to
go. In the last few years, there has been a significant increase in the number of events, conferences,
public dialogues etc. instituting discussions between social scientists and members of the public.
These dialogues have opened up a series of prospective ways to approach archaeological heritage
in a more inclusive and participatory manner. One such step was the Council of State’s decision in
2015 to maintain free access to the Western Hills at all times, which acts as a milestone during such
troubled, socially, politically and financially, times. It proved that despite the lack of legislation,
the changing societal values and determination can lead to greater change, setting an important and
positive precedent. This decision will hopefully set the path for further regulations in the way
archaeological sites are managed in Athens and Greece in general, and the progressive integration
of spaces in people’s daily lives.

It is necessary to keep fighting against the schemes that augment the gap between spaces of
archaeological heritage and the people. To obstruct their commercialisation through neoliberal
governance for their exploitation, gentrification of neighbourhoods and their potential
displacement. To ‘desanctify’ archaeological sites from their monumental and heterotopic status, re-activate their multitemporality and multiple materialities, and to re-integrate them into society. To actively deconstruct the monumentalisation of archaeological sites and to hinder their enclosure and isolation from society. To create institutional platforms through which communities of interest will be able to participate in the production of heritage, and not be passive receivers. To instill democratic models of community participation (Faulkner 2002), and to achieve a transformative, political praxis within the discipline which enables emancipatory practices in the midst of fast capitalism (McGuire 2008). Most importantly, it is time to “find out” more ways to redefine archaeological sites, and to be a part of their ongoing production and multitemporal cultural biography—especially during times like these when the need for more public spaces is necessary. As the reclamations of residential activists at Philopappou Hill and Plato’s Academy have proven, critical refection and active collaboration is not an easy task, but one that is necessary.
Appendix A

List of Archive Materials

- **Audio Recordings**
  - Interviews with participants
  - Sound clips of neighbourhoods/archaeological spaces of interest
  - My personal thoughts/ideas

- **Transcriptions and Translations**
  - Full/extracts from interviews
  - My personal thoughts/ideas

- **Journals**
  - Personal thoughts/notes/ideas from site and participant observations
  - Notes/reactions to interviews
  - Notes on workshops/seminars/group discussions

- **Videos (short)**
  - Assemblies
  - Activities/mobilisations
  - Archaeological spaces
  - Workshops/seminars/group discussions
  - Participant archives (videos of conferences organised by residents’ movement and assemblies/protests)

- **Photographs**
  - Site and Participant observations
  - Residential Assemblies
  - Protests/mobilisations
  - Social activities

- **Quantitative Data from ELSTAT (Hellenic Statistical Authority)**
  - Area maps (case studies/surrounding neighbourhoods) and population statistics (citizenship, employment, education)—2011 Census

- **Residential Movement Publications**
  - Leaflets/Brochures
  - Posters
  - Newspapers

- **Personal Communication with Participants**
  - Emails and SMS Messages
Appendix B

Press Release by Ministry of Culture claiming there will be no entrance fee imposed on Philopappou Hill.

Appendix C

Extended table of field work. Please note that although this is a more detailed version than the one presented in Chapter 5, it still does not encompass all the activities I was involved in during my research for this study. I have extended the summarised version to provide a better idea of the range of endeavours partaken for the fulfilment of this thesis.

2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plato’s Academy and Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>2012-2018</td>
<td>Leisure activities with friends (evening walks, star-gazing, picnics, bike-riding, football, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato’s Academy</td>
<td>March-November</td>
<td>Site Observations/photographs, personal notes, sound recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>March-November</td>
<td>Site Observations/photographs, personal notes, sound recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>March 2012-June 2017</td>
<td>British Library at Athens/Archival Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>January-December</td>
<td>Reviews on relevant literature from multiple disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>January-December</td>
<td>Accumulation of newspaper articles, social media content, official public documents concerning spaces of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>March 4 and 20</td>
<td>ELSTAT (Acquisition of Census and Maps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>March 18, 2013</td>
<td>Clean Monday Celebration/site observation, photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato’s Academy and Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>March-November 2014</td>
<td>Site Observations/photographs, personal notes, sound recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato’s Academy</td>
<td>June 27-29, 2014</td>
<td>Three Day Festival (Discussions on matters affecting park, concerts, activities, food)/participation in activities, photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple of Agrotera Artemis, Mets</td>
<td>September 26, 2014</td>
<td>MetsGiving Event (Katerina Velliou, Visual Artist), Coordination: Harikleia Haris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato’s Academy</td>
<td>October 5, 2014</td>
<td>Musical Event (Syndetimones) combined with presentation of site's history (Mihalis)/photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerameikos</td>
<td>October 31, 2014</td>
<td>Public Reading at Demosion Sema/participation/personal notes (Part of Microgeographies, Reveries and Realities Project. Coordinator: Harikleia Haris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mets, Athens</td>
<td>November 9, 2014</td>
<td>Group Discussion with Ardittos Association concerning archaeological site of the Temple of Artemis Agrotera and public archaeology. Part of Microgeographies, coordinated by Harikleia Haris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens/Omonoia Square</td>
<td>December 6, 2014</td>
<td>Demonstration/Commemoration of Alexandros Grigoropoulos' Death/Police Brutality/participation, personal notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Athens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 19, 2014</td>
<td>Pre-workshop meeting with archaeologists, architects, artists, and activists from Philopappou and Plato’s Academy for Citizens in Action Workshop/coordination, personal notes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>January 9, 2015</td>
<td>Dialogues in Archaeology Conference/ Citizens in Action Workshop and Presentation on Plato's Academy/coordination, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>January 22, 2015</td>
<td>Fences at the Pnyx/Phone call from Sophia (Police Station)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens/Philopoioi Poulopoulou</td>
<td>February 28, 2015</td>
<td>Meeting with activists/archaeologists/architects and artists from various movements- action for protection of archaeological spaces/coordination, material preparation, photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panteion University</td>
<td>March 4, 2015</td>
<td>Presentation at Panteion University with members of Ardittos Association for Temple of Artemis Agrotera, Mets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato's Academy and Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>April-November 2015</td>
<td>Peripatetic, unstructured and semi-structured recorded discussions with local residents and activists, archaeologists, artists, architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato's Academy and Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>April-November 2015</td>
<td>Peripatetic discussions on philosophical and existential matters with Dimosthenis and his dog/personal notes, photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>April 2015-July 2017</td>
<td>Meeting with Agne Pikioni and members of Philopappou Movement (including activists from other regions)/coordination, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>April 3, 2015</td>
<td>Poster posting for upcoming assembly with Dimosthenis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>April 26, 2015</td>
<td>Assembly to discuss and vote for environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>June 2, 2015</td>
<td>Party at the park (at night) to celebrate decision by Greek Council of State to grant access to Western Hills at all times/participation, personal notes after event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keratea</td>
<td>June 6, 2015</td>
<td>S.O.M.A (Scattered Open Museum of Attica) discussion panel (for more info, see: <a href="http://soma.nonplan.gr/">http://soma.nonplan.gr/</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>June 21, 2015</td>
<td>Assembly for the environmental concerns of the Hills/ participation, photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill and Plato's Academy</td>
<td>January-May 2016</td>
<td>Recorded and unrecorded, semi or unstructured interviews with local residents/activists/archaeologists/artists/architects. Some peripatetic on site, others at cafés or participants’ homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato's Academy</td>
<td>January 28, 2016</td>
<td>Recorded, semi-structured interview with former archaeologist at Plato's Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato's Academy</td>
<td>April 1, 2016</td>
<td>Recorded, semi-structured, peripatetic interview with former archaeologist at Plato's Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>May 21, 2016</td>
<td>Coffee and discussion about matters affecting the hill/personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato's Academy</td>
<td>September 24, 2016</td>
<td>Autumn Equinox Celebration, participation, photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>November 13, 2016</td>
<td>Assembly to discuss imminent privatisation of Orlof Park (adjacent to Philopappou Hill) /participation, photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>January 12, 2017</td>
<td>Coffee and discussion with local residents/activists about matters affecting the hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>February 12, 2017</td>
<td>Assembly for protection of park against Dionysus expansions/participation, photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>February 27, 2017</td>
<td>Clean Monday Protest/participation, photographs, personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>March 5, 2017</td>
<td>Assembly at Philopappou Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>April 8, 2017</td>
<td>Poster posting with Sophia and Andreas for upcoming assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>June-July 2017</td>
<td>Meetings with Sophia to discuss the hill and to water the plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill and Plato's Academy</td>
<td>June-August 2017</td>
<td>Recorded and unrecorded, semi or unstructured interviews with local residents/activists/archaeologists/artists/architects. Some peripatetic on site, others at cafés or participant’s homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>August 11, 2017</td>
<td>Girl's night out with members of Philopappou Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>August 31, 2017</td>
<td>Send off outing (my move to the UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato's Academy</td>
<td>December 17, 2017</td>
<td>Meeting/coffee/walk with members of Philopappou Residents' Movement, ended spontaneously at Dina's home for lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>December 19, 2017</td>
<td>Coffee and guided tour with Michalis, spontaneously joined by bystanders/personal notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>December 21, 2017</td>
<td>Videos of protests/demonstrations/assemblies at Sophia's house with Laura and Andreas, live commentary on past events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Philopappou Assembly: Site/Participant Observations/Thoughts

Sunday February 12, 2017—Meeting at Aeropagitou intersection

- Very cold and windy day, sun came out every so often, cold fingers and nose—made socialising and interacting a little bit more difficult, but despite cold weather, there were people gathering (at peak there were about 40-50 people). I saw a number of familiar faces from the neighbourhood and had the chance to speak to them. T from Petralona seems very adamant on promoting general issues concerning public spaces and the imposition of capitalism, beyond the case of the Hills. I approached her after the assembly and asked her if she would like to participate in my research and she kindly accepted—has provided me with her cell number and will get in touch soon.

- Very good location (as opposed to Loubardiaris Café where other meetings have been previously held) as there were a lot of passersby that stopped to ask what was happening—just the fact that they saw residents in an assembly could provide a motivation to go back to their own neighbourhoods and actively fight for what they want. I was also very interested to see how the mayor would have responded to the protest but he never came—perhaps he was informed that he would have to face the movement?

- First conversation that I witnessed as soon as I arrived was an older lady (seemed to be from a wealthy background?) thanking S for all her efforts through the years and how she worries that nothing will be left for the next generation “what will they do?” “they need to carry on this fight” “this place belongs to us and it belongs to them, the future generation”. When A saw me he jokingly told me that I no longer stand a chance to work for the public sector (due to my frequent presence at assemblies and demonstrations).

- A and S explained what the purpose of the assembly was, gave a historical background to the events and clashes leading up to the present, also provided plenty of detail in regards to the legal aspect/process and what they are planning for the next few months (until the June trial). Throughout the assembly, I kept thinking about the significance of the cause and the determination of those present to make a change—taking into consideration that they were at the assembly on a cold winter’s day (on a Sunday too!), when they could be spending time at home with their families.

- I collected some of the few signatures (open letter to the mayor) and was asked about what was happening—it was quite uncomfortable at first and I felt that people would not want to spend time to listen to what I had to say, but slowly I started to gain more confidence. A was very collected when a few people started to go against the protest, claiming that the privatisation of the space would be beneficial to the local community. I watched in awe as he tried to tackle these particular individuals and tried my best to make not of all the counter-arguments in case I had to deal with a similar situation. I felt as though my Greek was failing me when having to communicate in an efficient and dynamic way.

- Some of the first reactions of residents that were present addressed the urgent need of mobilisation in order to get their claims across. They referred to past instances of mobilisation and how these worked for the residents in terms of achieving what they wanted. A member of an autonomous anarchist collective from Petralona (and I am assuming a resident?) was very polemical about the way to deal with state services and suggested further protests—this time at actual Ministries for more visibility (T told me she can get me in touch with the collective).
Appendix E

Table of Interviews

This table shows a list of the participants that consented to being interviewed and recorded for the purposes of this research, in order of appearance. The interviews that were recorded with a recording device are indicated with an (AR) next to the date we held our meeting. The table further indicates a second date that denotes a follow-up interview which in many cases was not recorded with a device but through concurrent note-taking. The participants—along with many informants which provided their thoughts and information regarding these spaces and grassroots movements in Athens and beyond—were met on a frequent basis, whether at assemblies, workshops, conferences or outings. The last informant preferred not to be recorded with a device as she felt it would make her uncomfortable and would not be able to focus on answering questions as she would wish—thus our interview was recorded through my own notes. The table includes the format of the interview conducted as well as the mode—peripatetic around locations of interest or sitting at a participant’s home or at a café, which in many ways affected the development of our discussions through the affective movement in space or even the distance from the spaces discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT NAME</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>FORMAT/MODE</th>
<th>RECORDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Retired)</td>
<td>21/12/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At participant’s home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Date (Start/End)</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepi Lazaridou</td>
<td>Archaeologist</td>
<td>17/11/2015 (AR)</td>
<td>Patisia</td>
<td>3:34:24</td>
<td>Semi-structured</td>
<td>At participant’s home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Retired)</td>
<td>21/12/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>25/7/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:46:34</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>Peripatetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>18/12/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:20:20</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>Peripatetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimosthenis</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>19/9/2015 (AR)</td>
<td>Philopappou Hill</td>
<td>00:56:22</td>
<td>Semi-structured/Unstructured</td>
<td>Audio recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>27/7/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:54:28</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>Peripatetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Recording Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandros</td>
<td>Residential Activist</td>
<td>3/8/17 (AR) 19/12/17</td>
<td>Plato’s Academy</td>
<td>1:42:11</td>
<td>Semi-structured/Unstructured Peripatetic</td>
<td>Audio recording/concurrent notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihalis</td>
<td>Residential Activist</td>
<td>29/10/15 (AR) 19/12/17</td>
<td>Plato’s Academy</td>
<td>2:47:42</td>
<td>Semi-structured Cooperative Café/Peripatetic</td>
<td>Audio recording/concurrent notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilianna</td>
<td>Residential Activist</td>
<td>13/9/2014</td>
<td>Plato’s Academy</td>
<td>2:01:10</td>
<td>Semi-structured/Unstructured/Peripatetic Concurrent notes/audio recording</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Phoebe</td>
<td>Artist/Activist</td>
<td>9/9/2016 (AR)</td>
<td>Kypseli</td>
<td>1:47:44</td>
<td>Unstructured Café Audio recording/concurrent notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleni Tzirtzilaki</td>
<td>Artist/Activist/Architect</td>
<td>5/11/2015 (AR)</td>
<td>Monastiraki</td>
<td>1:00:31</td>
<td>Semi-structured Café Audio recording/concurrent notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iosif Effraimidis</td>
<td>Architect/Activist</td>
<td>27/7/17 (AR)</td>
<td>Mets</td>
<td>1:57:26</td>
<td>Semi-structured Peripatetic Audio recording</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Recording Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy Petropoulou</td>
<td>Human Geographer/Activist</td>
<td>15/11/2015 (AR)</td>
<td>Neo Faliro</td>
<td>2:18:10</td>
<td>Semi-structured Café</td>
<td>Audio recording/concurrent notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katerina</td>
<td>Architect/Activist</td>
<td>6/6/2015 (AR) &amp; 6/5/2017</td>
<td>Lycabettus Hill</td>
<td>2:38:29</td>
<td>Unstructured At participant’s home</td>
<td>Audio recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evi A.</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>24/6/2017 3/1/2018</td>
<td>Pagkrati, Exarcheia</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Unstructured At participant’s home/ Peripatetic</td>
<td>Concurrent notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

One of the numerous mindmaps I created in order to help me visualise the issues and the elements involved in my work. This particular mindmap focused on the case of Philopappou Hill and the concept of the right to the city (26/5/2015).
Appendix G

Primary coded notes of interview with urban geographer Christy Petropoulou (15/11/2015) before full transcription/translation.
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Appendix H

An example of some of the personal notes/reflections I made either during meetings or after. This particular encounter was after a meeting with Sophia regarding a group discussion we were planning with other residential activists, archaeologists, and activists interested in the commons (at Pilopoioi Poulopoulou on 28/2/2015). It was held on January 24, 2015, a few days after the “Citizens in Action Workshop” for the Athens 2015 Dialogues in Archaeology Conference (9/1/2015).

Sophia

"Proposed that our team work in a space that belongs to the municipality of Athens - so far in a sense - we are meeting in the "Wolf's den" - so that in the particular space, they can make some "force", with the new government, things seem to be a bit brighter - like there is light at the end of the tunnel - there are several workshops in Synta that have noted the party and are already aware of funding issues. Moreover, the cooperation in the Argos region movement has enabled them to cooperate on certain occasions (need to find where and when) and Stella believes that there is hope for change.

Considering the active character of the new student, there could probably be a need for dealing with the ancient past. What could this mean for archaeological sites, access to these interaction between local communities, but also the relationship of the archaeologists with communities?"

In terms of the main issues concerning the active members of the movement,
Sophia

1. balladists refreshment stand should be open (re-activate for two main reasons)
   1. easy way to refuel entry to store
   2. arch sense of will be under "symbol"
   3. cooperation - a more electric communal presence

Laura

- 2nd corner - Dionyssos restaurant - extension

Sophia

- longer & disordered file that shows that there was a private contractor that "measured" the Dionyssos space which had actually been given to the municipality of Athens (that was never打听ed) later. The added an extra 15 m² (conclusively inflation) to request that are needed to have acquired 6 PhDs in order to decipher mental issues and what the real influence motivations lie behind these entries. Also the is it part for a given as the legal owner of the space (and not municipality of Athens) not sure of it.
Appendix I

My attempt to draw the view from the Andiros Platform (7/6/14). It was then that I decided that I should always carry my camera with me.
Appendix J

Declaratory Act of 1993, constructed surface listed as 1,150 metres squared (indicated in red).
Declaratory Act of 2014, constructed surface listed as 1,165.15 metres squared (indicated in red). The previous sentence declares the space as belonging to EOT, and not the municipality.
Appendix K

Declaratory Act of 2018, claiming to modify the Declaratory Act of 2014 by modifying two the phrasing (as highlighted): “on behalf of”, shifting the ownership of the land occupied by the fine-dining restaurant Dionysus to its rightful owner, the Municipality of Athens.

9. Την υπ’ αριθ. Α 14176/ 4.3.1961 «Περί ειδοποιήσεως της γενομένης καταθέσεως οφειλομένης αποζημιώσεως εκ της αναγκαστικής απαλλοτριώσεως ακινήτων προς διαμόρφωσιν του χώρου μεταξύ των οδών Ουσιαστικοί, Ροζ. Κάλλα και Ρίτσ. Γαρβάλδη παρά τον Λόφον Φιλοπάππου» (ΦΕΚ 33/Δ΄/23.3.1961).

ΑΠΟΦΑΣΙΖΟΥΜΕ

Τροποποιούμε την υπ’ αριθ. 508226/02.07.2014 (ΑΔΑ : 74ΑΞ469ΗΙΖ-ΟΞ6) Απόφαση που αφορά στην Διαπιστωτική Πράξη Νομιμότητας Εστιατορίου – Αναψυκτηρίου «ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ» στο λόφο Φιλοπάππου, μόνο ως προς το δεύτερο εδάφιο, απαλείφοντας τη φράση «...υπερ ΕΟΤ...».

Η ΥΠΟΥΡΓΟΣ ΤΟΥΡΙΣΜΟΥ
ΕΛΕΝΑ ΚΟΥΝΤΟΥΡΑ

ΠΙΝΑΚΑΣ ΔΙΑΝΟΜΗΣ

1. Γραφείο Γενικού Γραμματέα ΕΟΤ Αν. Τσόχα 7, Αθήνα

ΑΠΟΔΕΚΤΕΣ ΓΙΑ ΚΟΙΝΟΠΟΙΗΣΗ:

1. Γραφείο Υπουργού
2. Γραφείο Γεν. Γραμματέα Τουριστικής Πολιτικής & Ανάπτυξης
3. Γραφείο Προϊσταμένης Γενικής Διεύθυνσης Τουριστικής Πολιτικής
Appendix L

Open letter to Mayor of Athens urging him to take action concerning the 13 acres of land adjacent to Dionysus fine-dining restaurant on foothill of Philopappou Hill (12/2/2017).

ΕΠΕΝΓΔΥΤΕΣ ΤΡΕΖΕΤΕ!
Ο ΚΑΜΙΝΗΣ ΧΑΡΙΖΕΙ ΧΩΡΑΦΙΑ
ΣΤΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΠΑΠΠΟΥ

ΑΝΟΙΧΤΗ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΔΗΜΑΡΧΟ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ κ. Γ. ΚΑΜΙΝΗ

Κύριε Δήμαρχε,
Σας βαρύνει η ευθύνη για τη διάσωση του κοινόχρηστου χώρου έκτασης 13 στρεμμάτων στην περιοχή του εστιατορίου «Διόνυσος» στο λόφο Φιλοπάππου. Ο χώρος αυτός στο Ρωμαϊκό Σχέδιο περιγράφεται ως «πλατεία και άλσος».

Γνωρίζετε ότι ο Δήμος έχει ολοκληρώσει την διαδικασία απαλλοτρίωσης και ότι η ΕΟΤ προσπαθεί να υφαντάει τον χώρο που ανήκει στο Δήμο ισχυριζόμενος ότι έχει χαρακτηριστεί τουριστική περιοχή. Ο κινδύνος εκποίησης μέσω του Υπερπηγαίου ένας πλούς αρατώς. Ωφελείται να προχωρήσει άμεσα στις ελάχιστες νομικές ενέργειες που απαιτούνται για να μεταγραφεί ο συγκεκριμένος κοινόχρηστος χώρος στο Δήμο, να δηλώθει στο Κτηματολόγιο ως δημοτική περιουσία και να παραμείνει κτήμα άλλων μας.

Είμαστε δημότες του Δήμου Αθηνών με έννομο συμφέρον και επιφυλασσόμαστε παντός νομίμου δικαιώματός μας.

Κάτοικοι περιοχών Φιλοπάππου
Appendix M

Leaflet produced by the coordinating team of residential activists of Plato’s Academy against the construction of the Mall (18/6/2017).
Appendix N

Three day festival at Plato’s Academy. The orange banner reads: “We want a different future for our neighbourhoods”. The yellow/purple poster presents the main event—a concert against fascism supported by various artists. The festival further included poetry reading (bottom right), children’s plays (next page, top), a temporary art gallery (next page, middle) and various other events including yoga and games for young visitors to engage in (27-29/6/2014).
Appendix O

Makeshift exhibition of the history of Plato’s Academy through old newspaper articles. Some of the issues faced by residents in the past have remained unchanged in time (27-29/6/2014).
Appendix P

Stray Tsoliades on Philopappou Hill/filming for the documentary *Amygdaliá* (28/5/2017). Photos used with permission by Christina Phoebe and Yiannis Lascaris.

IMDB link to the film: [https://www.imdb.com/title/tt9786290/?ref_=nm_ov_bio_lk1](https://www.imdb.com/title/tt9786290/?ref_=nm_ov_bio_lk1) [Last Accessed 21/05/2019].
Appendix Q


Εκθέσεις για το Φιλοπάππου

Το 1971 έγινε εκσυγχώρηση του λόφου του Φιλοπάππου στον Δήμο μας με αρμοδιότητες διοίκησης και διαχείρισης. Από τότε ο Δήμος έχει προχωρήσει σε σημαντικές ενέργειες, ενδεικτικά:

- πλήρωση του λόφου, και κύρια στις περιοχές που γειώνει με τα Άνω Πετράλωνα και το Κοκκάκι, με εκτεταμένες επιχειρήσεις που κάλυψαν τα υπολείμματα των λατομείων που λειτουργούσαν εκεί το 1955 και τον ασβεστολίθο που είχε απομένει μετά την απομάκρυνση των οικιών
- φύτευση χιλιάδων φυτών σε όλο το χώρο του λόφου
- αντιλεκτήρια, υποδομές αρέσκειας, πιαγκάκια, διαδρόμους, μονοπάτια, θεατράκι, δρομάκια ήπιας άθλησης κτλ.

Ο λόφος με αυτές τις ενέργειες έχει μετατραπεί σε σημαντικό πνεύμονα πρασίνου, δημιούργησε ένα άγριο και βιώσιμο συνοικισμό, και είναι δεμένος σε μια ζωή της σύγχρονης πόλης και με τα υπολείμματα της αρχαίας.

Ωστόσο, εδώ και χρόνια οι υποδομές και η βλάστηση καταστρέφονται.

Παντού παρατηρούνται έντονα φανόμενα διάβρωσης που σερίζονται σε μεγάλο βαθμό στην αποψίλωση της μέσης βλάστησης. Τα μονοπάτια έχουν σε ένα μεγάλο ποσοστό καταστραφεί από νεροφάγωμα. Έντονα προβλήματα διάβρωσης παρατηρούνται στα πράσινα έδαφα, οι οποίοι είχαν αποψίλωσεί από τα φαυτά που στη συγκρότησαν στόχο είναι να μετατρέψει σε κόρτισσα σημεία καταστροφής τους και με επιπλέον συνέπεια την απόφραξη των αγωγών ομπρέλων.

Το ποιο ανθοσχηματικό είναι ότι βλάστηση έχει υποστεί απώλειες ακόμα και του 30% για διάφορους λόγους. Τα φαυτά αντιμετωπίζουν σοβαρά προβλήματα ξηρασίας και πολύ κακές διαχειριστικές πρακτικές ενώ το αρδευτικό οικοτοπικά δεν λειτουργεί. Εντύπωση αλεγής προκαλούν τα κονιόλια που έχουν προσβληθεί σε απώλεια μεγάλο βαθμό από την πυκνοκάμπτη.

Ακόμα μεγαλύτερη είναι η ζημιά που έχει προκληθεί στα Έργα Πικίωνη, νεώτερο μνημείο και έργο τέχνης. Εδώ το πράσινο είναι αναπόλοπτο οτικός στην απόφαση της κήρυξης τους ως νεώτερου μνημείου. Δεν αναπληρώνεται καμία απώλεια φυτών, πολλές δεντροπολύνουν χάσκουν άδειες, οι κλαδεύσεις των φυτών γίνονται χωρίς να τηρούνται οι οδηγίες Πικίωνη και όλοι οι άνθρωποι, άπως οι χρησείς, μετατράπηκαν με κλάδωση σε μεγάλα δέντρα.
Ολα αυτά επιτείνωνται τα τελευταία χρόνια από την στάση της Αρχαιολογικής Υπηρεσίας που καθ’ υπέρβαση των αρμοδιοτήτων της είναι αρνητική σε κάθε φύτευση στο λόφο του λόφου.

Ο Δήμος, επειδή είναι θεσμικά υπεύθυνος για το πράσινο του λόφου Φιλοτάτιπου, οφείλει άμεσα να παρέμβει:

- Να αρχίσει η άρδευση του λόφου — εφόσον έχουν πλέον αποκατασταθεί οι αντιλή
- Να εκπονηθεί μελέτη για το πράσινο που περιλαμβάνεται στην κήπωση των Εργα Πικάλι η η συμμόρφωση και η συμμορφώσης με την Ευρωπαϊκή Κοινωνία περί ιστορικών κήπων και την Κοινωνία περί προστασίας και αποκατάστασης νεωτέρων μνημείων
- Να εκπονηθεί διαχειριστική μελέτη για τα 700 στρέμματα του λόφου που θα αφορά το τοπίο, το πράσινο και υποδομές
- Ανεξαρτήτως μελετών, να αντικαθιστώνται οι επηρεγμένες πεζούκες, ελιές, καταφύγια κλπ.

Κωνσταντίνος Τάτης
MSc Γεωπόνος

[Σημειώσεις και υπογραφή]
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