

INTRODUCTION

Research objectives

This research project set out to investigate the various elements that formulate and influence the relationship between archaeology and local communities, using Greece as a case study. The main aim was to identify what the role of archaeology has been in Greece in socio-political and economic terms.

The key areas of investigation were the following:

- What has the relationship between archaeology and local communities been in Greece in terms of its social, economic and political impact? How and why has this relationship developed?
- What are the public values of archaeology in Greece and how have they altered under the influence of socio-political and economic change?
- What are the current aims and the objectives of Greek archaeology as identified in the priorities of the Archaeological Service?
- What strategies might archaeology implement in Greece in order to reinforce its socio-political and economic role and become more reciprocal and relevant?

The ultimate question this research project raises is: 'for whom is archaeology practiced in Greece?'

The Rationale

Over the last thirty years, developments in several fields have increased archaeology's awareness of the socio-political context it operates in. In post-colonial contexts, pressure from the human rights movement has forced archaeologists to acknowledge their responsibility towards the living members of the indigenous cultures they study. This has led to collaborative approaches

in archaeological research that today constitute the field of community archaeology (see 1.2).

Community archaeology has also been taken up in European contexts. A long tradition of antiquarianism had resulted in the formation of many local societies in Britain in the nineteenth century. After a long break during the years of professionalisation of archaeology and intensive rescue work, grassroots engagement with local heritage and the past resurfaced. Such initiatives usually aim to raise awareness and to increase local involvement in the management of archaeological resources (see 1.3).

At the same time, archaeologists have become increasingly alarmed by the low levels of public interest and awareness of the threats that development pressures pose to the finite and exhaustible archaeological resource, as well as the socio-political and economic value of archaeology. This was the beginning of public archaeology (McGimsey 1972) as a field that later developed, in other parts of the world, to include any aspect of archaeology relevant to the public sphere (see 1.4).

A broadening of theoretical considerations through the post-processual critique of archaeological theory has also contributed in this direction. Closer collaboration with socio-cultural anthropology has resulted in the formation of new fields of enquiry, such as archaeological ethnography (see 1.5).

These developments have had further implications for the discipline. The emergence of archaeological ethics (see 1.6) and a more solid understanding of the political role of the discipline, especially in relation to nation-state building processes (see 1.7), are of particular interest to this research project.

As a result, a new place for the public in the treatment and management of archaeological resources has increasingly appeared. Intergovernmental organisations and NGOs promote international charters and good practices, such as the value-based approach, where even an auditing role has been assigned to the public (see 1.8 and 1.9). Research in public perceptions of the past and of archaeology has been conducted to inform these efforts. The impetus for such research has come either from the realisation that archaeological work requires public support or from the acknowledgment that archaeological resources are public possessions that need to be shared and that their benefits need to be disseminated (see 1.10).

These developments have not reached all quarters of the discipline yet. For instance, Greek archaeology has had little interaction with them because its fundamental role in the nation-state and identity building process has given it the focus of a national mission of the highest importance. For Greece, connecting the nation-state that emerged from the War of Independence with the Ottoman Empire in 1830, and ancient Greece, a complex cultural entity, many centuries old, and predominantly its Classical phase, has been the guarantee of political emancipation and future existence in the West. The safeguarding of antiquities thus became a political priority and the Classical past, the foundation of Greek national identity (see 2.1.2).

The high political profile of the past very quickly led to the establishment of a state-run archaeological system and the promise of universal protection through the use of state resources. Although neither its resources nor its administrative structure have ever been close to adequate for the fulfilling of its mission (see 2.1.3 and 2.1.5), the absolute right of state ownership of antiquities, as granted by powerful legislation (see 2.1.4), has brought positive results for the protection of antiquities. However, in spite of the fact that this system has

worked well in itself and has contributed immensely to the safeguarding of Greek antiquities, it has also had negative consequences that require reconsideration and re-adaptation.

The national mission of archaeology and the symbolic capital of the past have shaped individual and collective identities and filtered public perceptions through a variety of mechanisms such as museums, public education and the media (see 2.2.2-6). The past and the study of its remains have been trapped in this role until today, when nation-building processes are no longer relevant, for any other than a nationalist populist discourse.

Archaeology has thus lost its relevance to the people in Greece. Even more than that, the discipline has lost its mission and its role. Settled within the security of state structures, the field has not gone through a period of re-negotiation with society (Kotsakis 2002). The questions of *why do we protect archaeological heritage* and *whom do we protect it for* have been left unasked for too long. As a consequence, archaeology, despite its acknowledged potential, is no longer reciprocal to the current needs of society. The discipline has not re-orientated its efforts towards domains of primary importance, such as education, social cohesion and political awareness.

Additionally, the legal requirement of state ownership of antiquities as well as the richness of the country in archaeological resources necessitates the collaboration of the people in protection. What this currently means is that people do not have a choice but to collaborate by dealing with patience and at their own cost with the demands of a complicated system of archaeological management. Such problems are amplified when they are considered in a geographically restricted context such as local communities, where archaeologists, locals, authorities and other sub-groups of the public interact in

a spatially restricted locality and often for a long time. Issues of the system itself and of the broader socio-political and economic context further influence the relationship between archaeology and these communities.

The field's lack of relevance, as well as the necessity of public collaboration in protection, raises the ethical and practical issue of archaeology's reciprocity. It is an ethical obligation for archaeology, especially for a state-run system of archaeological management, to return its benefits to the people in the name of whom it is practiced. Finally, a reciprocal relationship between archaeology and local communities can ensure the sustainable protection of their archaeological heritage through the sharing of responsibility and of the benefits of this protection.

Approach

Chapter One examines the emergence of archaeological concern for its socio-political context both inside and outside the discipline. Indigenous archaeology and public archaeology, post-processual archaeology and common fields of research with social anthropology are discussed along with developments from the field of management of archaeological resources, i.e. international charters and conventions. Archaeological ethics and research into the relationship between archaeology and nationalism are considered for their influence on the discipline. Finally, surveys of public perceptions of archaeology that have been conducted around the world are reviewed in detail.

Chapter Two is a critical examination of the emergence of archaeological management and policy in Greece and of its political, economic, legislative and administrative context. Particular attention is paid to the more public aspects of archaeological practice. These include formal and top-down approaches such as

archaeological museums, public events and educational programmes organised by the Archaeological Service, the presentation of archaeological narratives in school textbooks, a survey conducted among students regarding archaeology, and a critical discussion on the ways archaeological news is reported in the press. This is followed by a review of recent research regarding the relationship of archaeology with local communities throughout Greece. Finally, an attempt to identify more informal and bottom-up approaches to archaeology is made by briefly reviewing recent efforts from NGOs and civil society movements.

Chapter Three presents the approach to the fieldwork designed to answer the questions posed above, in which the methodology is discussed in detail. Quantitative and qualitative methods are presented separately. The chapter concludes with a consideration of the project's constraints, implications, and necessary explanation of the way the data has been presented.

Chapter Four comprises the three case studies undertaken: the archaeology of each area, the history of that archaeology, their operation as sites of archaeological interest, the local communities and their development, and the current state of affairs between these communities and archaeology.

Chapter Five brings together the work conducted and considered in this thesis. The first section analyses what the overall relationship between archaeology and the case study communities has been, including more specific aspects in social, economic and political terms. Wherever necessary, the relationship is discussed historically. In the second section, the public values archaeology has been found to inspire are identified, with discussion of whether these have changed over time. The third section evaluates the aims and objectives of Greek archaeology as they have emerged from interviews with state officials and academic archaeologists operating in the region. In the fourth section, strategies

applied to date and further considerations regarding the reciprocity of archaeology are discussed. Finally, the question of 'for whom is archaeology practiced in Greece' is examined. The chapter ends with a discussion of further issues that were identified during research and analysis.

The conclusions present a summary of the patterns and relationships discussed.