

Maria Kouri

## OWNERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION: DEMOCRATISING THE GOVERNANCE OF ANTIQUITIES

### Abstract

In Europe an increasing shift towards participatory cultural heritage governance is observed, opening the way to the meaningful inclusion of grassroots stakeholders in sharing heritage ownership and administration. In Greece, history politics and current cultural policies underline the symbolic and instrumental value of heritage, reinforcing a state-centric governance model, particularly concerning antiquities. By analysing state policies, rhetoric and projects on heritage between 1994–2013, we purport that state-centrism in antiquity governance is perpetuated, despite the constitutionally provided “complementarity of duties” between the State and citizens. Nonetheless, participatory practices concerning antiquities and contested heritage are growing. The paper explores some prominent cases in Greece, highlighting the expanding role of decentralised authorities and citizen associations. Concluding, it formulates explorative empirical propositions on the factors enabling or impeding participatory heritage governance, in order to serve as basis for the much needed in-depth, long-term research that is presently lacking.

**SŁOWA KLUCZE:** zarządzanie dziedzictwem kulturowym w Grecji, partycypacyjne zarządzanie dziedzictwem kulturowym, starożytności, sporne dziedzictwo, DIAZOMA, zdecentralizowana władza

**KEY WORDS:** Greek heritage policy, participatory cultural heritage governance, antiquities, contested heritage, DIAZOMA, decentralised authorities

### Introduction

At European level the interest in researching and enabling participatory governance in cultural heritage is growing. Participatory governance “can be understood either as a process by which authority is released and empowerment ensured or as a process which allows for the adoption of management models whereby responsibility is shared and decisions are taken by communities rather than by individuals.”<sup>1</sup> Central

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Sani, B. Lynch, J. Visser, A. Gariboldi, *Mapping of practices in the EU Member States on Participatory governance of cultural heritage to support the OMC working group under the same name (Work Plan for Culture 2015–2018)*, EENC Short Analytical Report, 2015, p. 3.

elements of participatory cultural heritage governance are ownership, shared responsibility and active involvement of every tier of society in decision-making (e.g. central and decentralised authorities, non-profit and for profit entities, NGOs, networks, communities and citizens, etc.). This major shift concerns material and intangible heritage, including archaeology, even in countries where governance of antiquities has been traditionally state-centric. Still, participatory rhetoric is “not always coupled with a real ceding of authority, or with a real effort to assess the realities behind the phenomenon,” and not every participatory practice can “be labelled as [...] ‘participatory governance’.”<sup>2</sup> Subsequently, further research on the topic, as well as the design and application of successful models and tools to promote the inclusion of grassroots stakeholders in cultural heritage governance are needed and called for.<sup>3</sup>

In Greece governance of antiquities remains the State’s exclusive domain.<sup>4</sup> Through bibliographical research and analysis of policy rhetoric and heritage projects from 1994 to 2013 we support that history policy, in addition to the instrumentalisation of heritage, dictate heritage policy in Greece, maintaining the State’s predominant role in the protection and accessibility of antiquities. Having said that, tentative steps towards the wider involvement of grassroots agents in antiquities management are gradually taken, but these are largely understudied and have an uncertain future. Accordingly, the main objective and contribution of this paper is to examine the most prominent of such existing participatory efforts in Greece and formulate explorative empirical propositions on the factors enabling or impeding participatory cultural heritage governance. These propositions intend to serve as basis for further systematic research, which is much needed but currently lacking.

## 1. History Policy and State-centrism in Greece

Antiquity administration in Greece has been state-centric ever since the dawn of the Modern Greek State due to the antiquities’ ideological, political and symbolic charge. During the Hellenic Enlightenment and the subsequent War of Independence against Ottoman occupation, antiquities were a focal point of the identity and pride of the enslaved *Genos*. They were also testimony to Greece’s liberty and territorial claims, and an affirmation of the country’s right to be a legitimate part of the western world as the source of European civilisation.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the link of modern Greeks to

<sup>2</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> European Commission, *Call: Participatory approaches and social innovation in culture. Research and Innovation*, 2015, European Commission website, <https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/cult-coop-06-2017.html> [access: 19.10.2016].

<sup>4</sup> C. Dallas, *Country profile Greece* [in:] *Compendium Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe*, Council of Europe, 2013, p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> M. Herzfeld, *Ours once more. Folklore, Ideology, and the Making of Modern Greece*, University of Texas, 1982, pp. 13–15, 20–26; I. Morris, *Archaeologies of Greece* [in:] I. Morris (Ed.), *Classical Greece: ancient histories and modern archaeologies*, Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp. 8–47.

their ancient counterparts often mobilised international assistance for Greece in Europe and across the Atlantic,<sup>6</sup> which Hamilakis & Yalouri view as an “exchange of symbolic capital for economic capital”;<sup>7</sup> still, arguments against the relation of ancient with modern Greeks usually proved more influential, especially when political and financial concerns were at stake.<sup>8</sup> Thus, antiquities came to enjoy complete protection by the Greek State, which has served as guarantor and guardian of this national and international treasure ever since the first archaeological law in 1832.<sup>9</sup>

The current archaeological law (3028/2002) offers varied definitions and degrees of ownership and protection of material and intangible cultural heritage. In addition to the territorial, a spherical criterion is assumed recognising as part of the country’s heritage tangible and intangible vestiges by different civilisations that imprinted on Greek territory and history.<sup>10</sup> Four heritage categories are defined following a chronologic and genre typology.<sup>11</sup> The first two will concern us here:

1. “**Mnimeia**” or **Cultural objects**<sup>12</sup> encompass monuments from Prehistory to 1830 A.D.,<sup>13</sup> including prehistoric, ancient, Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine and Post-Byzantine vestiges (incl. Ottoman, Frankish and Venetian).
2. Similarly, **Archaeological Sites** range from Prehistory to 1830 A.D. Terrestrial or aquatic, they contain monuments or indications of having been residential, religious or burial sites. The joint protection and administration of monuments with their natural environment as a cohesive space is legally stressed, so that surviving monuments are viewed and studied in the context of a historic, aesthetic and functional complex.<sup>14</sup>

Heritage categories enjoy different degrees of protection according to their date of origin and significance. Especially ownership and possession of antiquities, as well as ownership of excavation finds belong to the People (State), and cannot be alienated by sale or adverse possession. Antiquities also receive full and augmented protection without need of state-issued classification acts.<sup>15</sup> These are demanded in varied degrees for heritage post 1453 A.D., the ownership right of which can be exer-

<sup>6</sup> A. Repousis, “*The Cause of the Greeks*”: *Philadelphia and the Greek War for Independence, 1821–1828*, “*The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*” 1999, 123 (4), pp. 333–363.

<sup>7</sup> Y. Hamilakis, E. Yalouri, *Antiquities as symbolic capital in modern Greek society*, „*Antiquity*” 1996, 70, p. 119.

<sup>8</sup> M. Kouri, *Beyond the Atlantic... Ancient Greek ideals in Greek America*, “*Platon*” 2015, 60, Athens: Papazisis, p. 479.

<sup>9</sup> V. Petrakos, *Dokimio gia thn arxaiologiki nomothesia*, Athens 1982.

<sup>10</sup> D. Voudouri, *Law and the Politics of the past: legal protection of Cultural Heritage in Greece*, “*International Journal of Cultural Property*” 2010, 17, p. 553.

<sup>11</sup> L. 3028/2002.

<sup>12</sup> Another alternative to the Greek term used in legislation (deriving from the word memory) could be “*Testaments of Memory*.”

<sup>13</sup> 1830 signifies the beginning of the recent era, when Greece was proclaimed a sovereign, independent state.

<sup>14</sup> D. Voudouri, *Law and the Politics...*, p. 554; D. Christophilopoulos, *Prostasia politistikon agathon*, Athens 2005, p. 13.

<sup>15</sup> L. 3028/2002.

cised by non-State agents under specific terms and conditions. Thus, the State bears the main weight of heritage protection, particularly regarding antiquities. It also assumes the authority to designate “which cultural objects are worthy of protection,” applying choices that unavoidably have ideological and political dimensions.<sup>16</sup>

Anyhow, the present law supports the equal treatment of monuments calling for a move away from archaeo-centrism,<sup>17</sup> which emphasised almost exclusively the discovery and care of classical antiquities even to the detriment of vestiges from other eras and civilisations. Indeed, only gradually and influenced by the Romantic Movement did the First Kingdom of Greece exhibit a wider concern for Byzantine antiquities, folklore and recent heritage – a concern which was reflected in subsequent laws and established museums.<sup>18</sup> Today, the State’s mission is to “support scientific research, preservation, protection and promotion of cultural heritage”<sup>19</sup> from antiquity to the present day.

## 2. Objectives of State Heritage Policy

### 2.1. Policy Axis 1: Safeguarding heritage

Aligned with international developments the State assumes protective, preventive, repressive and corrective measures aiming at the sustainable administration of heritage.<sup>20</sup> These are summarised in:

1. Identification, research, documentation and study of cultural heritage.
2. Conservation; prevention of destruction, deterioration or damage to heritage.
3. Maintenance and restoration.
4. Prevention of antiquity theft, illicit excavations and exportation.

Since 1994 state budgets have been supported by Community Structural Funds (CSF), enabling the implementation of numerous heritage projects. “Protection and preservation of cultural heritage” is a recurring objective in the Operational Programmes (OP) for culture,<sup>21</sup> leading to the revelation, research, conservation and restoration of heritage, as well as to the prevention of heritage deterioration by natural phenomena or manmade causes.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>16</sup> D. Voudouri, *Law and the Politics...*, pp. 554–555.

<sup>17</sup> D. Christophilopoulos, *op.cit.*, pp. 34–36.

<sup>18</sup> D. Voudouri, *Law and the Politics...*, pp. 551–552.

<sup>19</sup> P.D. 104/2014.

<sup>20</sup> L. 3028/2002.

<sup>21</sup> HMoC, *CSF 2000–2006. Operational Programme “Culture”. Full text, 2005*; EYTOP, Status of included Projects by Announcement, NSRF 2007–2013, 2014, <http://ep.culture.gr/el/Pages/description.aspx> [access: 9.10.0215]; L. Mendoni, *Culture as a strategic factor for development in the Programming Period 2014–2020*, General Secretariat for Culture, Ministry of Education and Religions, Culture and Sports, Athens [n.d.].

<sup>22</sup> HMoC, *Conservation, restoration, promotion. The scientific committees’ work*, Ministry of Culture, Athens 2008.

An analysis of realised heritage projects indicates a persisting emphasis on Antiquities; Byzantine heritage is visibly represented, while Post-Byzantine heritage (including recent and “contested” – i.e. Ottoman heritage) features less. Additionally, renowned sites and museums are particularly favoured. Indeed, the OP “Tourism-Culture” (2<sup>nd</sup> CSF 1994–1999) was criticised for focusing on a small number of acclaimed national museums, sites and monuments, while “interventions in the museum sector covered a small part of the qualitative and quantitative needs, even those closely related to tourism.”<sup>23</sup> Still, the OP “Culture” (3<sup>rd</sup> CSF 2000–2006) also prioritised the archaeological and byzantine/medieval “Museums of National Scope” situated “in urban centres or important tourism destinations,” attempting to address low visitor numbers that did not reflect the destinations’ large tourism share or the museums’ unique content.<sup>24</sup>

The political spotlighting of antiquities, and of classical heritage in particular, can be explained by their attributed political and symbolic value. The aesthetics and the philosophical and political thought of Classical Greece are considered part of the European Union’s shared “European Great Past”<sup>25</sup> and the basis of Western civilisation. Furthermore, the prioritised heritage resources are viewed by policy-makers as a means to reach non-cultural strategic aims, including tourism development, economy boosting and employment generation,<sup>26</sup> reflecting the economic and social instrumentalisation of culture.<sup>27</sup> Cultural heritage is considered Greece’s “comparative” and “competitive advantage” and a “strategic factor for development” because of its international distinguishability and its potential to support economic development, social cohesion, and improve Greece’s competitiveness by enriching and diversifying the country’s products and services.<sup>28</sup>

Accordingly, the OP “Tourism-Culture” aimed to develop heritage infrastructure and services to enhance Greece’s tourism offer and stimulate economic activity.<sup>29</sup> The OP “Culture” sought to diffuse projects and developmental benefits across all regions on an equity basis.<sup>30</sup> It included projects also for less-known, decentralised her-

<sup>23</sup> EYTOP, *Operational Programme “Culture” – Additional Programming*, 2007, pp. 11–15, <http://ep.culture.gr>. [access: 9.10.2015].

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 9–11, 18.

<sup>25</sup> K. Eder, *Citizenship and the Making of a European Society: from the Political to the Social Integration of Europe* [in:] K. Eder, B. Giesen (Eds.), *European Citizenship: Between National Legacies and Postnational Projects*, Oxford 2000, pp. 245–269.

<sup>26</sup> M. Kouri, *Merging Culture and Tourism in Greece: an Unholy Alliance or an Opportunity to Update the Country’s Cultural Policy?*, “The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society” 2012, 42 (2), pp. 73–74.

<sup>27</sup> C. Gray, *Commodification and Instrumentality in Cultural Policy*, “International Journal of Cultural Policy” 2007, 13 (2), p. 211; G. Vestheim, *Cultural Policy and Democracy: Theoretical Reflections*, “International Journal of Cultural Policy” 2007, 13 (2), p. 233.

<sup>28</sup> HMoC, *CSF 2000–2006...*; P. Geroulanos, Speech of former Minister of Culture at the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress “The Time for the Greek Economy”, HM of Culture and Tourism, press release, 1.12.2009; L. Mendoni, *op.cit.*

<sup>29</sup> EYTOP, *Operational Programme...*, pp. 11–12.

<sup>30</sup> HMoC, *CSF 2000–2006...*, pp. 4–6.

itage sites<sup>31</sup> to create new jobs, multiply the economic impact and improve quality of life also across Greek rural areas.<sup>32</sup> In the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF) 2007–2013 cultural projects were incorporated in other OPs<sup>33</sup> and aimed to stimulate cultural entrepreneurship, access to employment and sustainability.<sup>34</sup> This policy was compelled by austerity: valuable resources were allocated to safeguarding the country's invaluable heritage and generate regional employment outlets. With finances further deteriorating, for 2014–2020 special emphasis is given to the training of cultural practitioners and people; the continuous stimulation of cultural entrepreneurship; the extended application of new technologies; the reformation of the organisational structures of cultural institutions; and, the more consistent development of cultural tourism.<sup>35</sup>

## 2.2. Policy Axis 2: Accessibility

More than testimony to human existence, memory and identity, cultural heritage can improve quality of life. The State must “disseminate cultural products among citizens [...] [and] cultivate citizen awareness regarding the protection of cultural resources,”<sup>36</sup> stressing the social dimension of safeguarding heritage and making it accessible.<sup>37</sup> Observing sustainability, an anthropocentric and culture-oriented concept of development is endorsed: incorporating cultural heritage in the socioeconomic sphere becomes a primary consideration in urban, developmental and environmental planning.<sup>38</sup> Accordingly, central policy objectives that are balanced with protective measures are:

1. Facilitation of people's access to, and communication with cultural heritage.
2. Promotion and integration of heritage in contemporary social life.
3. Education, arts education and cultivation of civilian awareness regarding heritage.
4. Protection of heritage as part of developmental, environmental and urban planning.

Correspondingly, heritage projects include efforts to: create “readable,” enjoyable, physically and intellectually accessible sites; update communication and exhibition ways to reach wider audiences and non-visitors; improve infrastructure to ad-

<sup>31</sup> HMoC, *Conservation, restoration...*, p. 9.

<sup>32</sup> A. Samaras, *Introduction by former Minister of Culture* [in:] *Operational Programme 2000–2006 – Photographic Collection*, Managing Authority of Culture Section (EYTOP), Athens [n.d.], p. 3.

<sup>33</sup> “Improvement of the entrepreneurship environment” (axis 3), “Facilitation of access to employment” (axis 7), and “Sustainable development and improvement of the quality of life” (axis 2).

<sup>34</sup> L. Mendoni, *op.cit.*

<sup>35</sup> *Ibidem.*

<sup>36</sup> P.D. 104/2014.

<sup>37</sup> D. Christophilopoulos, *op.cit.*, pp. 34–36.

<sup>38</sup> E.g. Laws 2742/1992; 2508/1997; 3028/2002.

dress people's physical, social and personal needs; and, "revitalise" heritage sites by involving them in community life through appropriate uses.

Particularly the OP "Culture" aimed to ameliorate infrastructure for heritage sites; enhance their services (e.g. update exhibitions; offer educational programmes, conferences, lectures, publications; exploit new technologies; organise museum shops and cafés, etc.); and, include them in international museum networks, signifying an extroverted cultural strategy.<sup>39</sup> Similarly, NSRF 2007–2013 supported projects to create and improve cultural infrastructure by upgrading museum exhibitions and services, the equipment of archaeological sites, and people's access to them.<sup>40</sup>

Indicating the State's intention to enable the inclusion of non-mainstream visitors and to fight social exclusion and racism, some projects focused on improving access "to the wide public and to special social groups,"<sup>41</sup> including disabled persons and the "Others." The latter are defined as: third countries (including EU member-states); neighbouring countries, with which Greece shares a long history with "ongoing tensions or residual tensions of the past, often causing feelings of mistrust, rivalry, even enmity;" and, ethnic, religious, refugee and immigrant groups co-existing in Greece (e.g. Muslim and Jewish communities, Roma, immigrants from the Balkans, Africa, Asia, the former Soviet bloc, etc.).<sup>42</sup>

Inclusion efforts in heritage are mainly undertaken by the Ephorates of Antiquities<sup>43</sup> and consist of educational and artistic events, and technological applications to reach a diverse public, fostering social sustainability.<sup>44</sup> These projects are mostly designed and offered through a top-down model, even though the need for bottom-up approaches often features in policy rhetoric<sup>45</sup> and small steps to this direction are being gradually undertaken. The Action "*With the Roma to the Museum*" (PROGRESS 2007–2013), coordinated by the Byzantine and Christian Museum, aimed "to foster the accessibility of the Roma populations to cultural heritage, to stimulate their historical self-knowledge, to communicate to broader strata of society features of the Greek Roma community that defy stereotypical views."<sup>46</sup> The "experimental character"<sup>47</sup> of this project (alternatively, the cultural democracy aspect of it) was the active cooperation of archaeologists with representatives of each participating

<sup>39</sup> EYTOP, *Operational Programme "Culture"...*, pp. 19–21.

<sup>40</sup> EYTOP, *Status of included Projects by Announcement*, NSRF 2007–2013 (last update: 21.03.2014), 2014, <http://ep.culture.gr>. [access: 9.10.2015].

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>42</sup> HMoC, *National Strategy for the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue*, 2008, p. 5, [http://interculture.culture.gr/gr/strategy\\_greece.pdf](http://interculture.culture.gr/gr/strategy_greece.pdf). [access: 30.10.2015].

<sup>43</sup> Geographically decentralised agencies of the State Archaeological Service, under the jurisdiction of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture.

<sup>44</sup> M.X. Garezou, *Design and programming of the Ministry of Culture and Sports for the future of Greek museums* [in:] *The future is here. One-day conference at Benaki Museum, 4.12.2014*, 2014, <http://www.blod.gr/lectures/Pages/viewlecture.aspx?LectureID=1297> [access: 9.10.2015].

<sup>45</sup> HMoC, *National Strategy...*, pp. 10–11.

<sup>46</sup> Byzantine and Christian Museum, *With the Roma to the museum*, HMoC & Sports – Byzantine and Christian Museum, Athens 2014, p. 2.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 4.

Roma community to design, apply and evaluate customised programmes. According to Roma constituents, the action was successful; still, one archaeologist acutely observed that an important prerequisite of “success” is long-term repetition, as the latter may lead “to future demand initiated by the Roma community, not just by the Ministry.”<sup>48</sup>

### 3. Complementarity of duties: an open issue

Our analysis of Greece’s main heritage policy objectives and projects leads to two questions: firstly, which aspects of participation are endorsed; and, secondly, to which kind, or rather to whose heritage. Starting with the first question, we would define the following aspects of Participation:

- **Receptive aspect:** breaking down physical, intellectual, practical and psychological barriers to allow people’s reception and enjoyment of cultural resources.
- **Creative aspect:** people’s involvement in cultural production in a professional or amateur capacity.
- **Operational aspect:** people’s functional engagement in different stages of cultural management (e.g. safeguarding, running, promoting, advocating, etc.) on a professional or volunteer basis.
- **Political aspect:** stakeholders’ participation in decision-making and policy planning concerning the administration of cultural resources.

We will focus on the two final aspects, since they describe the content of participatory heritage governance as inclusive partnerships involving diverse stakeholders, sharing responsibility in both the strategic planning and operational aspects of heritage administration.

The Greek Constitution defines the protection of the cultural environment as “state duty and everyone’s right” (art. 24, §1), highlighting the complementarity of duties between State and citizens.<sup>49</sup> The State retains primary responsibility for preserving the public asset of cultural heritage on behalf of citizens, but the need for people’s active involvement is also recognised, theoretically allowing participatory heritage governance.

To this day antiquity administration remains state-centric. Ancient vestiges are extremely valuable and vulnerable, and the State can guarantee scientific and professional ethics, offer infrastructure, organisational and institutional support, and secure funds and certified personnel towards the safeguarding and accessibility of Greece’s irreplaceable heritage for public benefit. Furthermore, since heritage is linked with the national territory, state ownership expresses peoples’ “collective right over ob-

<sup>48</sup> M. Lychounas, *To the Byzantine monuments of Drama* [in:] Byzantine and Christian Museum, *With the Roma to the museum*, HMoC & Sports – Byzantine and Christian Museum, Athens 2014, p. 9.

<sup>49</sup> D. Christophopoulos, *op.cit.*, pp. 34–36.



jects lying still undiscovered and, in any case, judged too important to be at the mercy of purely private and coincidental interests.<sup>50</sup>

Nonetheless, the exclusion of non-state agents from treating, managing or administering antiquities (particularly up to 1453 A.D.) creates issues of constitutionality,<sup>51</sup> as it denies decentralised authorities, associations, other stakeholders or private individuals the right to be legitimately involved in heritage administration (such as the creation and operation of archaeological museums, which are virtually exclusively state-owned and run). State-centrism also questions the capacity of non-state agents to safeguard heritage through proper scientific methods by considering the State Archaeological Service as the only one capable of administering and promoting archaeological resources appropriately – “something which is neither self-evident nor obvious.”<sup>52</sup> As we will explore below, promising participatory cultural heritage practices have begun emerging recently, potentially opening the way to implementing the constitutionally provided complementarity of duties.

### 3.1. Involving decentralised authorities

Since the 1980s regional and local authorities have been increasingly motivated to enrich the cultural life of their respective communities through: arts and folk culture projects; the creation and operation of cultural centres, libraries, museums, galleries, theatres, etc.; and, the repair and conservation of folk or historic buildings to establish social or cultural spaces (e.g. L. 165/1980; L. 1416/1984; P.D. 76/1985; L. 2218/1994). Still, decentralised authorities may not organise or run archaeological museums and sites, but they increasingly assume promotional activities of local heritage and seek to organise arts events in archaeological sites. These efforts always depend on the approval of the Archaeological Service, which prioritises the protection of sites sometimes even against local interests.

Cultural cooperation between the State and decentralised authorities occurs through Programming Contracts of Cultural Development. In 2006 the updated Codex of Municipalities and Communities extended the content of these Contracts to cooperative heritage projects on the protection, conservation and promotion of monuments (including antiquities); interventions on historic or traditional buildings and settlements; and, preservation and dissemination of heritage elements.<sup>53</sup> The Codex has led to an increasing involvement of decentralised authorities in safeguarding archaeological spaces, denoting the significance of the latter to local communities.

One of the first such Contracts on antiquities was signed by the Municipality of Megalopolis (the Peloponnese), the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the Ar-

<sup>50</sup> D. Voudouri, *Law and the Politics...*, p. 557.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 555.

<sup>52</sup> D. Voudouri, *Kratos kai Mouseia. To thesmiko plaisio ton arxaiologikon mouseion*, Athens, Thessaloniki 2003, p. 439.

<sup>53</sup> L. 3463/2006.

chaeological Receipts Fund. The Municipality would contribute 500,000 Euros to the conservation, restoration, consolidation and promotion of a considerable part of the local ancient theatre, as well as of dispersed architectural fragments conforming to existing studies; additionally, it would finance necessary studies ensuing during the project's implementation.<sup>54</sup> Possibly due to administrative changes of the state agencies involved<sup>55</sup> this project was considerably delayed. Following two amendments concerning the contracting parties and the project's duration, in 2014 another two-year Contract for the same project was signed adding a new partner, the Region of the Peloponnese. The Municipality would contribute the remaining sum (425,839.60 euro) to the implementing state agent, namely the Ephorate of Antiquities of Arcadia. In all versions of the contract the Municipality's role was limited to funding the project and participating with one representative in a three-member Controlling Committee.

Since 2010 austerity and a growing shortage of public funds have led to an increase of such contracts. An overview of the latter reveals their scope gradually expanding: restoring, conserving and protecting heritage sites (e.g. PC Big Theatre of Gortyna<sup>56</sup>); cataloguing, digitizing and archiving archaeological finds (e.g. PC Theatre Ancient Makyneia<sup>57</sup>); continuing excavations (e.g. Municipality of Kalamata, 2011<sup>58</sup>); and, lately, even supporting accessibility and exhibition projects in archaeological museums (e.g. Municipality of Santorini<sup>59</sup>). The cooperation of University archaeology departments is at times also secured to assist in the projects' research aspects (e.g. PC Cephalonia and Ithaca<sup>60</sup>).

These synergies develop largely according to the Megalopolis legal model described above, consigning to decentralised authorities a 'financial supporter' role. Regions and Municipalities have vested interest in projects of unearthing, conserving, restoring, and studying local antiquities, which are a source of local identity, pride and quality of life, and an important developmental resource that can attract tourism,

<sup>54</sup> Municipality of Megalopolis, 2010; 2011; 2013; 2014.

<sup>55</sup> Municipality of Megalopolis, 2013.

<sup>56</sup> Prefecture of Herakleion, *Programming Contract of Cultural Development: Excavation and Restoration of the Big Theatre of Gortyna*, 2010; Region of Crete, *2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment of the Programming Contract: Excavation and Restoration of the Big Theatre of Gortyna*, 2014.

<sup>57</sup> Municipality of Antirrhion, *Programming Contract of Cultural Development: Protection-Promotion of the Theatre of Ancient Makyneia*, 2010.

<sup>58</sup> Kalamata.gr, *Programme Contract of Cultural Development*, 28.12.2011, [http://www.kalamata.gr/assets/deltiatypou/20111229\\_programmatiki169.pdf](http://www.kalamata.gr/assets/deltiatypou/20111229_programmatiki169.pdf) [access: 26.10.2015].

<sup>59</sup> Aftodioikisnews.gr, *Programming contract between HMoC and the Municipality of Santorini for the promotion of antiquities*, 27.06.2015, <http://www.aftodioikisnews.gr/%CE%B4%CE%B7%CE%BC%CE%BF%CE%B9/%CF%80%CF%81%CE%BF%CE%B3%CF%81%CE%B1%CE%BC%CE%BC%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%AE-%CF%83%CF%8D%CE%BC%CE%B2%CE%B1%CF%83%CE%B7-%CF%85%CF%80%CF%80%CE%BF-%CE%B4%CE%AE%CE%BC%CE%BF%CF%85-%CF%83%CE%B1/> [access: 26.10.2015].

<sup>60</sup> Region of the Ionian Islands, *Amendment and Programming Contract between the Prefecture of Cephalonia and Ithaca, the University of Ioannina and the Ministry of Culture and Tourism*, Dec. no: 45BΣ7AE-ΞΑΔ, 2011 [access: 26.10.2015].

stimulate economic activity, enrich the local environment and retain/invite inhabitants. However, all projects are planned, implemented and supervised by the State. The weaker representation of the funder (i.e. the Municipality) in the Controlling Committee (usually 1 vs. 2 votes for the State) reveals interesting power-relations: safeguarding antiquities against potentially damaging arrangements are prioritised to funders' interests. Hence, the State defends its profile as guarantor of scientific ethics and protector of antiquities.

This relatively recent form of central-decentralised government cooperation sometimes stalls due to bureaucratic and cash flow issues, but projects get generally realised. The total number and sums of these Contracts are hard to establish, as an official database is lacking. Pertaining to ancient theatres, it would seem that 37 Contracts have been signed since 2010, pledging about 11 million Euros.<sup>61</sup>

Interestingly, an addendum to the Megalopolis 2014 Contract recognises “the decisive contribution of the citizens’ association “Diazoma” in searching for resources, supporting the restoration of the Megalopolis Ancient Theatre, and promoting the programming text.”<sup>62</sup> Similarly, “DIAZOMA” congratulated the local authorities’ decision to fund the restoration of a significant monument as an act “carrying a high symbolism; namely, the importance and priority which our care and love for our monuments assume in conditions of crisis.”<sup>63</sup>

### 3.2. Citizen Associations: A waking force

“DIAZOMA-Citizens for Ancient Theatres” is a non-profit citizen association founded in 2008. Its mission is to support the research, safeguarding and promotion of ancient “viewing/listening spaces” and incorporate them in contemporary life through appropriate uses.<sup>64</sup> DIAZOMA strives to raise awareness on the diachronic value of ancient theatres and disseminate knowledge concerning the theatres’ protection, conservation and proper administration.

DIAZOMA’s particular contribution is the consequent cultivation of a sense of personal responsibility and ownership of ancient heritage among civilians. Indeed, it has pioneered in creating motivated citizen networks and enabling synergies between state and public and private agents towards the joint conservation, promotion, study, and revitalisation of theatrical sites. To this end it rallies, organises and chan-

<sup>61</sup> DIAZOMA, *Table of Funding*, 2016, [http://www.diazoma.gr/GR/Page\\_05-01.asp](http://www.diazoma.gr/GR/Page_05-01.asp). [access: 26.10.2015].

<sup>62</sup> Municipality of Megalopolis, Decision 487/2014, 17/12/2014, p. 9.

<sup>63</sup> Megalopoli FM, *Stavros Benos – DIAZOMA: Congratulations for the contract for the restoration of the Ancient Theatre of Megalopolis*, 29.07.2015, [http://megalopolifm.blogspot.gr/2015/07/blog-post\\_306.html](http://megalopolifm.blogspot.gr/2015/07/blog-post_306.html). [access: 26.10.2015].

<sup>64</sup> DIAZOMA, *Founding charter*, 2008, [http://www.diazoma.gr/GR/Page\\_002-02-01.asp](http://www.diazoma.gr/GR/Page_002-02-01.asp). [access: 26.10.2015].

nels funds<sup>65</sup> through sponsorships by enterprises, donations by foundations (e.g. the Stavros Niarchos Foundation<sup>66</sup>) and crowd-funding setting up “Money-Boxes” (bank accounts) for every ancient theatre under the slogan “*Adopt a Theatre*”. Secondly, DIAZOMA connects stakeholders in safeguarding ancient theatres. It has been instrumental in the ratification of the State-regions/municipalities Contracts and, in cooperation with various agents it pursues the incorporation of ancient theatres in the socioeconomic life of different regions in a sustainability framework by preparing and proposing studies to create Cultural Itineraries and Archaeological Parks. Finally, DIAZOMA organises awareness events involving schools and young people, local tourism businesses, local authorities, civil organisations and other groups to foster the sense of individual responsibility and ownership towards heritage. DIAZOMA also supports voluntary service efforts, which it guides and focuses through the assistance of specialised researchers.<sup>67</sup>

Continuously growing, DIAZOMA has become an important agent in antiquity safeguarding, supporting the State’s work from a bottom-up perspective. Seeking the reasons behind its success we should look, firstly, to the people conceiving and participating in this original idea:<sup>68</sup> capitalising on their know-how and connections they present scientifically sound ideas, draw important supporters and gain public visibility. Secondly, DIAZOMA insists on transparency in funds administration posting every sum on its website, recognising each and every donor. Finally, DIAZOMA’s web media enable individuals and agents everywhere to receive key information about specific theatres, become easily and effectively involved, and follow-up their contribution.

Looking at external success factors we purport that the enduring fiscal crisis has had two main effects: firstly, it gravely circumscribed the public sector’s ability to support socio-cultural structures stressing the need to establish alternative methods and funding sources. Secondly, the crisis has affected people’s mentality: it has led either to debilitating disillusionment or to dynamic mobilisation towards assuming personal responsibility for critical issues – including safeguarding heritage. DIAZOMA proposes an alternative approach to traditional state-centrism by promoting an

<sup>65</sup> Amounting to about 4.9 million Euros (DIAZOMA, *Table of Funding*).

<sup>66</sup> In Greece, the acclaimed, private Stavros Niarchos Foundation has inaugurated a new form of public-private cultural partnership, by funding the construction of the SNF Cultural Center. Upon completion, the Centre will be donated to the Greek State “which will undertake its full control and operation, to be used and enjoyed by the Greek people” (Stavros Niarchos Foundation Cultural Center, *Vision*, [n.d.], <http://www.snfcc.org/about/vision/> [access: 23.12.2015]). Similarly, the International Foundation for Greece has entered an agreement with the State to fund the study of a new bioclimatic museum in Delos and has also offered to fund its construction (A. Karatzapheris, *Delos will have the museum it deserves*, “Eleftheros Typos. Technes” 2015, 4). Thus a new form of public-private cooperation also in the field of ancient heritage has been very recently inaugurated, but only its realization will allow in-depth analysis and evaluation.

<sup>67</sup> Sani et al., *op.cit.*, p. 15.

<sup>68</sup> Among them Stavros Benos: a prolific public figure with an extensive career in local and national politics, has as Mayor of Kalamata and Minister of Culture. With extensive understanding of the politics of culture and of public administration, he is a respected figure in the cultural field.

understanding of heritage as a shared resource that requires the active, responsible involvement of everyone. It serves as a nexus pooling and channelling citizen initiative, enabling the individuals' self-directed financial (through donations) and socio-political (through advocacy, participation in activities etc.) participation in heritage preservation and promotion. Indeed, DIAZOMA's chairman underlines both the "maturity" of citizens, who now seek actively to cooperate with the State on protecting and owning ancient theatres, and DIAZOMA's contribution in expressing "a new way of thinking, dealing and managing issues that concern everyone."<sup>69</sup> By cultivating a civic mind-set of heritage ownership DIAZOMA promotes the time-honoured axiom of antiquities as a public asset perhaps more effectively than legislation or state policy, underpinning a shared, bottom-up approach that could offer a viable alternative to state-centrism.

Having said that, this bottom-up participation assumes mainly a financial or advocacy facet. Similarly to the Contracts the State remains the exclusive administering and implementing body. Consequently, partly the Operational but especially the Political aspects of "participation," which would enable the inclusion of non-state agents in antiquity governance, are not yet achieved. Another point of note is that DIAZOMA focuses on ancient theatrical spaces, namely a very distinctive heritage linked to the genesis and dissemination of Democracy. The question arises whether bottom-up mobilisation would be as strong, if other heritage resources were concerned (i.e. different types, eras, cultural expressions, contested heritage). Only the realisation of such ventures would offer reviewable data, but current indications are not promising.

Similar to DIAZOMA, the non-profit NGO "ELLINIKI ETAIRIA – Society for the Environment and Cultural Heritage" (est. 1972) rallies and channels support by different stakeholders. Its wider scope of action encompasses environmental issues, recent heritage, contemporary cultural creation, design and promotion of cultural routes, and lawsuits against decisions considered harmful to the natural and cultural environment.<sup>70</sup> According to the Society's website the organisation seems to gather smaller amounts and mobilise weaker civilian engagement. Reasons for this could be the Society's smaller visibility or the non-publication of donated sums. Moreover, the Society does not focus on antiquities but seeks to support recent heritage, which is less recognisable, and often has a local, rather than a national, character.

This observation leads to the second pertinent question posed earlier: to which kind of heritage – or, rather, to whose heritage- are participatory efforts endorsed? As this question is linked to ideological and history policy issues, our analysis will conclude with the case of Ottoman heritage.

---

<sup>69</sup> S. Benos, *Association of rescuing Ancient Theatres – DIAZOMA*, Stavros Benos website, 2015, <http://www.benos.gr/Diazoma.asp> [access: 26.10.2015].

<sup>70</sup> ELLET, *ELLINIKI ETAIRIA – Society for the Environment and Cultural Heritage*, 2015, <http://en.ellet.gr/> [access: 31.10.2015].

### 3.3. Contested heritage: whose heritage, which memories?

Spanning from the 14<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> century A.D., Ottoman heritage in Greece is considered part ancient-part recent, and is legally governed by mixed clauses of protection and ownership. Ottoman heritage is burdened with symbolism and nuances of nationality, due to the turbulent history of Ottoman occupation, subsequent Greco-Turkish wars, exchange of populations, and the recent immigration of Muslim populations.

Ever since the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Ottoman monuments in Greece have been systematically recorded, conserved and revitalised through original or compatible uses.<sup>71</sup> The 3<sup>rd</sup> CSF contained such projects,<sup>72</sup> including the publication of a bi-lingual volume with descriptive entries, historic documentation, preservation activities and the present state of 191 representative Ottoman religious and secular monuments in Greece.<sup>73</sup> In light of the National Strategy for the European Year of Inter-Cultural Dialogue the Ministry sought to address the scholars' increasing interest<sup>74</sup> and published "an aspect of our country's cultural heritage, which had not received enough attention in the past, but to whose protection and preservation the Greek state has devoted considerable effort."<sup>75</sup> Furthermore, the State cooperated with international foundations on restoring Ottoman heritage, as illustrated by the example of the Turkish Aga Khan Foundation which financed the study of the minaret of the Süleyman mosque in Rhodes (16<sup>th</sup> century A.D.).<sup>76</sup> The mosque was subsequently restored (1998–2005) to receive the Europa Nostra prize.<sup>77</sup>

As part of local developmental strategies decentralised authorities also increasingly seek to safeguard and promote local monuments, memory and identity, and build a distinct local image to draw inhabitants, investors and tourism. Exceptional is the case of Thessaloniki that is being branded as the crossroads of civilisations, by capitalising on its long-standing multicultural and cosmopolitan heritage as the centuries-old home of many different ethnic groups – Ottoman, Jewish, Armenians, who "alongside the native Greek population, they all left their characteristic mark on the city."<sup>78</sup> Nonetheless, local projects on contested heritage do not always

<sup>71</sup> E. Brouskari, *Introduction* [in:] *Ottoman Architecture in Greece*, Hellenic Ministry of Culture, Athens 2009, p. 19.

<sup>72</sup> Hellenic Ministry of Finance, *Competition and Shipping, Final Report 3<sup>rd</sup> CSF 2000–2006. Operational Programme "Culture"*, Tables III.9 "Expenses by measure and code of field of intervention" and III.5 "Complete presentation of projects", HMFCS, 2010.

<sup>73</sup> HMoC, *Ottoman Architecture in Greece*, Hellenic Ministry of Culture, Athens 2009.

<sup>74</sup> E. Brouskari, *op.cit.*, p. 18.

<sup>75</sup> I. Koltsida-Makri, *Prologue* [in:] *Ottoman Architecture in Greece*, Hellenic Ministry of Culture, Athens 2009, p. 16.

<sup>76</sup> E. Brouskari, *op.cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>77</sup> This restoration together with reconstructions of the Gothic chapel of Santa Maria del Burgo and the Orthodox Monastery of Agios Georgios were considered "paradigmatic examples of the reconstruction of monuments from three different dogmas" (G. Dellas, *Süleyman Mosque* [in:] *Ottoman Architecture in Greece*, Hellenic Ministry of Culture, Athens 2009, pp. 360–363).

<sup>78</sup> City of Thessaloniki & Hellenic Society for the Environment and Culture Thessaloniki Section, *Heritage walks in Thessaloniki*, City of Thessaloniki & Hellenic Society, Thessaloniki 2009.

gain universal approval, as demonstrated by the case of Kavala, home to a Muslim minority. The Municipality's decision to restore an Ottoman madrasah caused some civic groups to counter-suggest the application of limited funds towards safeguarding Hellenic heritage.<sup>79</sup> Alternatively, the majority of Kavalans (65.8%), including the Association of Greek Refugees from Asia Minor, backed "without fear or favour" the project, which will house the Museum of Hellenic Refugees.<sup>80</sup>

There seems to be no citizen association of the visibility and nature of DIAZOMA to raise awareness and support for contested heritage. Traces of grassroots engagement is discerned in smaller associations of a wider socio-cultural scope, as for example the movement "Co-existence and Communication in the Aegean." In addition to its social and intercultural communication projects, the movement co-supported the organisation of a successful two-day conference on "Ottoman monuments in Mytilene" under the auspices of ICOMOS-Greece, inviting Greek and Turkish scientists to juxtapose Mytilene with Ayvalık.<sup>81</sup> Though sporadic, such grassroots activities quite possibly indicate the tentative but sincere wish of local communities still neighbouring to "Others" to re-examine and, perhaps, reconcile with their contested past.

## Conclusions

Tentatively but surely significant changes take place in antiquities management in Greece. The organised bottom-up participation of various agents in safeguarding and advocating for antiquities is gaining ground and legislative support, highlighting the growing seeds of heritage ownership and potentially opening the way for the reconsideration of the existing state-centric model. Furthermore, the tendency to reconcile with contested heritage reflects a scientific and political maturity in line with the tolerance and diversity politics of the European Union, and translates into policies endorsing different parts of Greece's multi-faceted heritage.

However, as analysed in this paper, participatory approaches in antiquity administration in Greece are recent and slowly evolving. Despite the significance of this topic, at the time of writing this paper there is a certain shortage of relevant studies,

<sup>79</sup> Patriotiki Kinisi Politon Kavalas, *Announcement: On the Madrasah*, 22.02.2012, [http://patriotikikinisikavalas.blogspot.gr/2012/02/blog-post\\_1677.html](http://patriotikikinisikavalas.blogspot.gr/2012/02/blog-post_1677.html) [access: 31.12.2015].

<sup>80</sup> KavalaPress.gr, *The Association of refugees from Asia Minor in Kavala on the Madrasah*, 4.11.2013, 2013, <http://www.kavalapress.gr/o-sillogos-mikrasiaton-kavalas-gia-ton-mentrese/> [access: 31.12.2015]; Nea Egnatia newspaper, *Kavalans say "Yes" to the restoration of the Madrasah*, 18.03.2014, p. 16 [access: 31.12.2015].

<sup>81</sup> S. Balaskas, *The "monuments of intolerance" drew experts and ordinary citizens. Two-day conference under the auspices of ICOMOS Greece*, "Archaeology & Arts" 12.04.2013, <http://www.archaiologia.gr/blog/2013/04/12/%CF%84%CE%B1-%C2%AB%CE%BC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CE%BC%CE%B5%CE%AF%CE%B1-%CF%84%CE%B7%CF%82-%CE%BC%CE%B9%CF%83%CE%B1%CE%BB%CE%BB%CE%BF%CE%B4%CE%BF%CE%BE%CE%AF%CE%B1%CF%82%CE%BB-%CF%80%CF%81%CE%BF%CF%83%CE%AD/> [access: 31.12.2015].

empirical research and reliable data, underscoring the need for long-term research, also highlighted by Sani et al.<sup>82</sup> Concluding, we will draw from the cases presented to formulate explorative empirical propositions, in order to contribute an initial framework of factors enabling or impeding participatory antiquities governance, which can be further developed by future research.

Enabling factors include the ideological and political guidelines promoted both on a national and an international level, which emphasise the obligation to safeguard heritage in its totality and diversity adhering to sustainability guidelines. The involvement of a wide range of stakeholders is a way to establish alternative funding sources for heritage, endorse ownership and effectively incorporate cultural heritage in community life. As demonstrated by the DIAZOMA and ELLET cases, communication technologies can facilitate dissemination of information and grassroots mobilisation, but issues of trust can affect the establishment and outcome of synergies. Transparency in fund management and in decision-making processes, as well as the public profile of people and agents involved are very important in inspiring trust and raising support. Still, an exclusive dependence on charismatic personalities or renowned agents cannot guarantee the future of organisations or of synergetic relations. Solid, transparent, inclusive and efficient mentoring, management and legislative structures are needed, to capitalise on the public profile of leaders without depending exclusively on them. Finally, partners need to establish grounds of cooperation jointly aiming at mutually beneficial relationships.

On the other hand, history policy, traditional mentalities, outdated legal frameworks, and established *modi operandi* can preserve state-centric models, barring the wider inclusion of diverse stakeholders in heritage governance. As our analysis revealed, the role of decentralised authorities and of grassroots agents in Greece is limited mostly to financial support and, perhaps, advocacy, and does not extend to the Operational and, particularly, the Political aspects of participation, which remain the exclusive domain of the State. Furthermore, state and grassroots initiatives alike focus primarily on prominent heritage of national and European/international symbolism and of greater economic and marketing potential (e.g. ancient theatres, renowned archaeological sites, etc.). Other aspects of heritage draw weaker support, while contested heritage generates opposing attitudes, particularly among civilians as the Kavala case shows.

Subsequently two challenging issues persist. The first concerns equity in the protection of heritage resources: prominent aspects of heritage may inspire wider mobilisation and ownership but an exclusive focus on them can lead to limited or non-existent awareness and support for less-prominent or contested heritage. Care of heritage should be disassociated from popularity, social or economic value; the supportive mobilisation of communities in favour of their local heritage can act as a considerable balancing force to this direction. To avoid the commercialisation, commodification and endangerment of heritage and to protect its public character, a sustainable balance among economic, cultural, social and environmental values needs to be upheld.

---

<sup>82</sup> Sani et al., *op.cit.*, p. 4.



Secondly, equity in participation has to be more actively pursued. Motivators and barriers to grassroots participation in heritage governance need to be thoroughly explored, and new, successful and viable participatory models of heritage governance should be designed and tested. At its core this is a cultural democracy issue, which has to question hegemonic models and counter-propose political decentralisation in heritage governance, allowing the inclusion of various stakeholders (including minorities) in decision-making, administrative and managerial processes concerning their heritage. Only thus will these stakeholders be motivated to pursue actual ownership of their past, present, and future.

## Acknowledgements

The author is indebted to Assistant Professor Dr. Ioanna Spiliopoulou for suggesting invaluable reference material and sharing her archaeological expertise. She would also like to thank the organisers and participants of the International Colloquium “Sharing Memory” (Krakow 2015) for the fruitful discussions that helped shape this paper, as well as the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments.

## Bibliography

- Aftodioikisnews.gr, *Programming contract between HMoC and the Municipality of Santorini for the promotion of antiquities*, 27.06.2015, <http://www.aftodioikisnews.gr/%CE%B4%CE%B7%CE%BC%CE%BF%CE%B9%CF%80%CF%81%CE%BF%CE%B3%CF%81%CE%B1%CE%BC%CE%BC%CE%B1%CF%84%CE%B9%CE%BA%CE%AE-%CF%83%CF%8D%CE%BC%CE%B2%CE%B1%CF%83%CE%B7-%CF%85%CF%80%CF%80%CE%BF-%CE%B4%CE%AE%CE%BC%CE%BF%CF%85-%CF%83%CE%B1/> [access: 26.10.2015].
- Balaskas S., *The “monuments of intolerance” drew experts and ordinary citizens. Two-day conference under the auspices of ICOMOS Greece*, “Archaeology & Arts” 12.04.2013, <http://www.archaiologia.gr/blog/2013/04/12/%CF%84%CE%B1-%C2%AB%CE%BC%CE%BD%CE%B7%CE%BC%CE%B5%CE%AF%CE%B1-%CF%84%CE%B7%CF%82-%CE%BC%CE%B9%CF%83%CE%B1%CE%BB%CE%BB%CE%BF%CE%B4%CE%BF%CE%BE%CE%AF%CE%B1%CF%82%CE%BB-%CF%80%CF%81%CE%BF%CF%83%CE%AD/> [access: 31.12.2015].
- Benos S., *Association of rescuing Ancient Theatres – DIAZOMA*, Stavros Benos website, 2015, <http://www.benos.gr/Diazoma.asp> [access: 26.10.2015].
- Brouskari E., *Introduction* [in:] *Ottoman Architecture in Greece*, Hellenic Ministry of Culture, Athens 2009, pp. 18–22.
- Byzantine and Christian Museum, *With the Roma to the museum*, HMoC & Sports – Byzantine and Christian Museum, Athens 2014.
- Christophilopoulos D., *Prostasia politistikon agathon*, Athens 2005.
- City of Thessaloniki & Hellenic Society for the Environment and Culture Thessaloniki Section, *Heritage walks in Thessaloniki*, City of Thessaloniki & Hellenic Society, Thessaloniki 2009.
- Dallas C., *Country profile Greece* [in:] *Compendium Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe*, Council of Europe, 2013.

- Dellas G., *Süleyman Mosque* [in:] *Ottoman Architecture in Greece*, Hellenic Ministry of Culture, Athens 2009, pp. 360–363.
- DIAZOMA, *Founding charter*, 2008, [http://www.diazoma.gr/GR/Page\\_002-02-01.asp](http://www.diazoma.gr/GR/Page_002-02-01.asp) [access: 26.10.2015].
- DIAZOMA, *Table of Funding*, 2016, [http://www.diazoma.gr/GR/Page\\_05-01.asp](http://www.diazoma.gr/GR/Page_05-01.asp) [access: 26.10.2015].
- Eder K., *Citizenship and the Making of a European Society: from the Political to the Social Integration of Europe* [in:] K. Eder, B. Giesen (Eds.), *European Citizenship: Between National Legacies and Postnational Projects*, Oxford 2000, pp. 245–269.
- ELLET, *ELLINIKI ETAIRIA – Society for the Environment and Cultural Heritage*, 2015, <http://en.ellet.gr/> [access: 31.10.2015].
- European Commission, *Call: Participatory approaches and social innovation in culture. Research and Innovation*, European Commission website, 2015. <https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/topics/cult-coop-06-2017.html> [access: 19.10.2016].
- EYTOP, *Operational Programme “Culture” – Additional Programming*, 2007, <http://ep.culture.gr> [access: 9.10.2015].
- EYTOP, *Status of included Projects by Announcement*, NSRF 2007–2013 (last update: 21.03.2014), 2014, <http://ep.culture.gr> [access: 9.10.2015].
- Garezou M.X., *Design and programming of the Ministry of Culture and Sports for the future of Greek museums* [in:] *The future is here. One-day conference at Benaki Museum*, 4.12.2014, <http://www.blod.gr/lectures/Pages/viewlecture.aspx?LectureID=1297> [access: 9.10.2015].
- Geroulanos P., Speech of former Minister of Culture at the 20<sup>th</sup> Congress “The Time for the Greek Economy”, HM of Culture and Tourism, press release, 1.12.2009.
- Gray C., *Commodification and Instrumentality in Cultural Policy*, “International Journal of Cultural Policy” 2007, 13 (2), pp. 203–215.
- Hamilakis Y., Yalouri E., *Antiquities as symbolic capital in modern Greek society*, “Antiquity” 1996, 70, pp. 117–129.
- Hellenic Ministry of Culture, *Operational Programme 2000–2006 – Photographic Collection*, Managing Authority of Culture Section, Athens [n.d.].
- Hellenic Ministry of Culture, *CSF 2000–2006. Operational Programme “Culture”. Full text*, 2005, <http://ep.culture.gr/el/Pages/description.aspx> [access: 9.10.2015].
- Hellenic Ministry of Culture, *Conservation, restoration, promotion. The scientific committees’ work*, Ministry of Culture, Athens 2008.
- Hellenic Ministry of Culture, *National Strategy for the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue*, 2008, [http://interculture.culture.gr/gr/strategy\\_greece.pdf](http://interculture.culture.gr/gr/strategy_greece.pdf) [access: 30.10.2015].
- Hellenic Ministry of Culture, *Ottoman Architecture in Greece*, Hellenic Ministry of Culture, Athens 2009.
- Hellenic Ministry of Finance, *Competition and Shipping. Final Report 3<sup>rd</sup> CSF 2000-2006. Operational Programme “Culture”*, Tables III.9 “Expenses by measure and code of field of intervention” and III.5 “Complete presentation of projects”. HMFCS, 2010.
- Herzfeld M., *Ours once more. Folklore, Ideology, and the Making of Modern Greece*, University of Texas, 1982.
- Kalamata.gr, *Programme Contract of Cultural Development*, 28.12.2011, [http://www.kalamata.gr/assets/deltiatypou/20111229\\_programmatiki169.pdf](http://www.kalamata.gr/assets/deltiatypou/20111229_programmatiki169.pdf) [access: 26.10.2015].
- Karatzapheris A., *Delos will have the museum it deserves*, “Eleftheros Typos. Technes” 2015, 4.
- KavalaPress.gr, *The Association of refugees from Asia Minor in Kavala on the Madrasah*, 4.11.2013, <http://www.kavalapress.gr/o-sillogos-mikrasiaton-kavalas-gia-ton-mentrese/> [access: 31.12.2015].
- Koltsida-Makri I., *Prologue* [in:] *Ottoman Architecture in Greece*, Hellenic Ministry of Culture, Athens 2009, 16–17.

- Kouri M., *Merging Culture and Tourism in Greece: an Unholy Alliance or an Opportunity to Update the Country's Cultural Policy?*, "The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society" 2012, 42 (2), pp. 63–78.
- Kouri M., *Beyond the Atlantic... Ancient Greek ideals in Greek America*. "Platon" 2015, 60, Athens: Papazisis, pp. 457–485.
- Lychounas M., *To the Byzantine monuments of Drama* [in:] Byzantine and Christian Museum, *With the Roma to the museum*, HMoC & Sports – Byzantine and Christian Museum, Athens 2014, pp. 8–9.
- Megalopoli FM, *Stavros Benos –DIAZOMA: Congratulations for the contract for the restoration of the Ancient Theatre of Megalopolis*, 29.07.2015, [http://megalopolifm.blogspot.gr/2015/07/blog-post\\_306.html](http://megalopolifm.blogspot.gr/2015/07/blog-post_306.html) [access: 26.10.2015].
- Mendonni L., *Culture as a strategic factor for development in the Programming Period 2014–2020*, General Secretariat for Culture, Ministry of Education and Religions, Culture and Sports, Athens [n.d.].
- Morris I., *Archaeologies of Greece* [in:] I. Morris (Ed.), *Classical Greece: ancient histories and modern archaeologies*, Cambridge University Press 1995, pp. 8–47.
- Municipality of Antirrion, *Programming Contract of Cultural Development: Protection-Promotion of the Theatre of Ancient Makyneia*, 2010.
- Municipality of Megalopolis, *Programming Contract of Cultural Development: Restoration and Promotion of the Ancient Theatre of Megalopolis*, Decision 12/2010.
- Municipality of Megalopolis, Decisions: 545/2011 (1<sup>st</sup> amendment), 564/2013 (2<sup>nd</sup> amendment) and 487/2014.
- Nea Egnatia newspaper, *Kavalans say "Yes" to the restoration of the Madrasah*, 18.03.2014 [access: 31.12.2015].
- Patriotiki Kinisi Politon Kavalas, *Announcement: On the Madrasah*, 22.02.2012, [http://patriotikikinisikavalas.blogspot.gr/2012/02/blog-post\\_1677.html](http://patriotikikinisikavalas.blogspot.gr/2012/02/blog-post_1677.html) [access: 31.12.2015].
- Petrakos V., *Dokimio gia tin arxaiologiki nomothesia*, HMoC Athens 1982.
- Prefecture of Herakleion, *Programming Contract of Cultural Development: Excavation and Restoration of the Big Theatre of Gortyna*, 2010.
- Region of Crete, *2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment of the Programming Contract: Excavation and Restoration of the Big Theatre of Gortyna*, 2014.
- Region of the Ionian Islands, *Amendment and Programming Contract between the Prefecture of Cephalonia and Ithaca, the University of Ioannina and the Ministry of Culture and Tourism*, Dec. no: 45BΣ7ΛE-ΞΛΔ, 2011 [access: 26.10.2015].
- Repousis A., "The Cause of the Greeks": *Philadelphia and the Greek War for Independence, 1821–1828*, "The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography" 1999, 123 (4), pp. 333–363.
- Samaras A., *Introduction by former Minister of Culture* [in:] *Operational Programme 2000–2006 – Photographic Collection*, Managing Authority of Culture Section (EYTOP), Athens [n.d.].
- Sani M., Lynch B., Visser J., Gariboldi A., *Mapping of practices in the EU Member States on Participatory governance of cultural heritage to support the OMC working group under the same name (Work Plan for Culture 2015–2018)*, EENC Short Analytical Report, 2015.
- Stavros Niarchos Foundation Cultural Center, *Vision*, [n.d.], <http://www.snfcc.org/about/vision/> [access: 23.12.2015].
- Vestheim G., *Cultural Policy and Democracy: Theoretical Reflections*, "International Journal of Cultural Policy" 2007, 13 (2), pp. 217–236.
- Voudouri D., *Kratos kai Mouseia. To thesmiko plaisio ton arxaiologikon mouseion*, Athens, Thessaloniki 2003.
- Voudouri D., *Law and the Politics of the past: legal protection of Cultural Heritage in Greece*, "International Journal of Cultural Property" 2010, 17, pp. 547–568.

**Legal documents:**

Greek Constitution, 2001 amendment.

Laws: 165/1980; 1416/1984; 2742/1992; 2218/1994; 2508/1997; 3028/2002, 3463/2006.

Presidential Decrees: 76/1985; 104/2014.