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Chapter 1

Introduction

The selection of (world) heritage is the selection of history; it is where people come from and what they are. Although it is a highly political matter, the outcome of this process is supposed to be a reflection of the history of all the Greek. The way in which this is chosen and what is in the first place called heritage; what is preserved and what is listed (but also what is erased and denied for listing) is therefore a very important issue. Especially in Greece, which is seen as the foundation of European civilization, this selection is crucial, for it determines what the past, present and future of the Greeks looks like. Since not all history can be turned into heritage, decisions that have been made throughout the years about what histories to preserve and what histories—and therefore memories—to erase and how and by who these decisions and selections have been made will shed light upon the way Greece has been portraying and perceiving itself as a nation.

One ruling body which represents nations through their heritage is the World Heritage List. This list decides the international view towards the country and its inhabitants and with that the international view towards their national identity and their history. This World Heritage List is managed by UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization—which introduced ‘the convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage’ in 1972 (van der Aa 2005, 1). The roots of this organization lie in the League of Nations, which was established in 1920 in order to prevent war situations like World War I and aimed at maintaining peace. Sites on the World Heritage List can be listed after a State Party—a country which adhered to the World Heritage Convention—nominated the site and the World Heritage Committee decided to list it as a World Heritage site. A State Party can only nominate sites that have been put on a list which contains all the sites that are considered for nomination in the years to come, called the Tentative List. The first World Heritage sites were listed in 1978. Greece became a State Party in 1981 and the first Greek site was listed in 1986. As of today there are 17 Greek sites listed on the World Heritage List.

1.1 Main question & sub-questions

Main question

Are the changing attitudes towards the Greek past through time reflected in the Greek World Heritage List?

Sub-questions

- How have the (Greek) attitudes towards the Greek past developed through time?
- How has UNESCO changed since its founding in ideology, methods, goals etc.
- How has the Greek World Heritage List developed through time?
- Is there a trend to be seen in either the dominance or the underexposure of heritage out of certain periods, or a certain type of monuments?
- Does this trend deflect any general trends occurring in the World Heritage List?

1.2 Introduction: Greek Heritage or World Heritage?

Greece has a very rich and contested past which is still exists in its material remains. These material remains are “the physical, material traces and remnants of the glorious past; these are the things that, through their physical durability, bring into existence simultaneously the past and the present” (Hamilakis 2007, 293). These remains carry with them information about the past, but they also
provide “bridges between the imagination and the past regarded as eternally present and presentable through [their] physical traces” (Pearce 1998, 100). During the 19th century these structures have become “central to the production and continuous reproduction of national imagination” (Hamilakis 2007, 290). Although this is a nation-wide phenomenon, it is very relevant for Greece—especially in the early years of this phenomenon— for what is now called “the Greek Dilemma”. This dilemma covered the global admiration for the Greek history—and therefore heritage—that has forced Greece to share its heritage more than any other country. For many Europeans feel that more or less they are all descendants of the Greek civilization; “the Greek spirit is everywhere” (Lowenthal 1998, 234). “Greekish” objects have been traveling all over the world from the Roman times on because of the general interest in these Classical pieces of history. Some great pieces of these relics are these days to be found in abroad museums. As Lowenthal states: “Greece is the archetype of stress between local and global heritage” (Lowenthal 1998, 244). This notion that Greek (especially Classical) monuments “are simultaneously of national and (at least for the western imagination) global significance has caused [and partly still causes] a source of endless tensions, claims and counterclaims, and ritualized battles” (Hamilakis 2007, 288-289). One of these tensions has been the search for Greek national identity, for “the Greek identity held for an international audience which consequently challenged the limits of self-ascription against the ascription by others” (Kotsakis 1998, 45). This international audience held on to an idealized image of the past, in which Greece found both the positive and negative effects; at the one hand modern Greeks will always be associated with the perfect civilization of the Classical past (whether they want it or not) and with this they will constantly be reminded of the society they are expected to be (Yalouri 2001, 188). At the other hand this image of an idealized past can empower Greece, for with this almost global acceptance of modern Greece’s association with its Classical past, the accompanying power and leverage are more or less handed over to them (Lowenthal 1988, 734; Yalouri 2001, 195).

In a way—as already mentioned above—heritage is the social memory of a group and heritage-sites function as lieux de mémoire; the monuments and its surroundings bringing into the modern world “the depths of forgetfulness” leaving history to “burn with the memory of the senses” (Seremetakis 1994, 144; Alcock 2002, 21). In this process not all memories of all groups are equally represented, or in the words of Harrison: “Where heritage is involved, collective amnesia is common. What is remembered, as tradition or heritage, is selected from a vast range of built, natural and cultural environments, to celebrate the past and bolster the present. Shameful episodes are rarely given prominence” (Harrison & Hitchcock 2005, 6; Graham 1998, 277). So, what is perceived as heritage changes through time, for it is “history [which] is gradually being bent into something called Heritage [...]” (Hewison 1989, 21). There is no such thing as a static “history” or “heritage”. The concept of heritage will always change through time, for it represents the past as a nation wants to remember it at a certain moment in time. From this point of view, “heritage can be seen as the preservation of a potential lost [...] Heritage is born disappearing” (Peckham 2003, 7). Often what is left to be seen as the heritage of a country is “the result of a battle over social memory; it represents a struggle for control over a highly memorable space. The loser, characteristically, becomes invisible” (Alcock 2002, 5).

When it comes to Greece, the social memory seems to be dominated by the idealized memories of the Classical past. This assumption can be clearly illustrated by a well-known phenomenon that took place in the 19th and 20th centuries, and continues up to this day: The

---

1 The term was introduced by Pierre Nora in his works of 1948-1992
stripping of the Athenian Acropolis. At the site of the Acropolis only the Classical/Hellenic past is preserved. The other Turkish and medieval monuments – the Ottoman garrison and houses, the Frankish tower, the Turkish mosque and parts of the Ducal Palace – have vanished (Alcock 2002, 4-5). As mentioned before, the meanings of monuments have changed through time; the old meanings and functionalities of buildings have been gradually bent into mystical, ancestral meanings, which eventually got fused with Christianity and over time became sacred in the western imagination (Hamilakis 2007, 290). Hamilakis (2007) believes that this very notion of sacralization of antiquities “went hand-in-hand with the anxiety about purity and pollution; it is this anxiety, often expressed in aesthetic terms, that has led to the purification of monuments and sites, by removing all material traces that were seen as ‘matter out of place’ (usually the non-Classical ruins)” (Hamilakis 2007, 290). A similar effacing and purifying effect can be detected in the World Heritage List; what is listed represents the heritage and thus the social memory of a country and what remains unlisted and even structurally unnominated might well be an assembly of unwanted histories.

1.3 Demarcation of the topic. Problems and limitations

In this assessment an attempt is made to see if Greek nationalism is reflected in the Greek World Heritage List. Therefore, the attitudes towards the Greek past from the 18th to the 21st century will be examined. In this way, the overview of Greek nationalism will start at the time of the Greek Enlightenment, in which, according to Kitromilides (1997) “an awakening of national identities” occurred (Kitromilides 1997 in: Kotsakis 1998, 50). This “awakening” was driven primarily by the ideological concept of primordialism, “according to which the nation existed long before any state formation was achieved” (Kotsakis 1998, 50). The historical background will therefore start in the period the Greek Enlightenment enveloped itself in; the very end of the period of Ottoman rule (1453-1826). This chapter (2.1) is based primarily on Richard Clogg’s work A Concise History of Greece (1992). In chapter 3, the sites on the Greek World Heritage List of UNESCO, as well as the sites on the Tentative List and the rejected sites will be evaluated. This evaluation is complicated by unequal documentation. The primary source of information consists of documents that can be found on the UNESCO website, consisting of, amongst others, the reports of all the World Heritage Committee sessions, including the decisions made during these sessions. However, it appears there is much more official documentation on the listed sites then there is on the rejected sites. Concerning the sites on the Tentative List, only a small description of its history and its main monuments are given on Greece’s UNESCO webpage. And since the information on the website is – in case of the listed sites– often (a part of) the text used as justification for listing, this is also probably true for the sites on the Tentative List (this is, however, not a certainty). Because of this, reasons for nominations by the State Party and rejections by the Committee are vague and leave much room for interpretation.
Chapter 2
Greek Nationalism
The emergence of a Greek national identity and the construction of a national topos.

2.1 Historical background and changing directions of nationalism
1453-1826: The period of Ottoman rule
In 1453, with the Fall of Constantinople, Greece, which was a great Christian bastion at this time, was captured by the Islam. During this period of Ottoman rule, which lasted from 1453 till 1826, a Turkish millet system was in use, which “organized” people on the bases of their religion instead of their language or nationality. In this period Greece was part of a large multicultural empire, which brought a certain amount of autonomy, however, the categorization that came with the Orthodox millet system brought with it multiple forms of restricting discriminations in everyday life, which eventually led to revolts against the Ottoman rule. These revolts were primarily undertaken by the klefs, who were a great example of pre-nationalist armed resistance to the Turks. During the 16th and 17th centuries the hopes of the Greeks to be freed from the Ottoman yoke seemed to be farfetched and mostly relying on some sort of divine intervention. In the 18th century, however, freedom for the Greek people seemed to become a more realistic hope. This more hopeful prospect was strengthened by the increasingly militarily, territorially and economically weakened Ottoman Empire during the course of the 18th century and especially at the end of the 18th century, after the victory of Russia (the “fair-haired people” who were seen as sort of divine by the Greeks) over the Ottoman Empire in the Great War (1768-1774), the “pre-national” movement began. One other factor in the boost of this movement was the emergence of a widely dispersed and prosperous mercantile class, with which Greece came to dominate the imperial trade. This emergence helped the intellectual revival of the last three decades of the 18th and the first two decades of the 19th century, which was a vital element in the development of an ethnic Greek (instead of Orthodox) consciousness.

In the first decades of the 19th century Greek society became increasing differentiated and underwent rapid change, which was coupled with a growing will to be freed from the Ottoman rule. A perfect example for a freed Greek land was provided by the Ionian Islands, which were placed under British protection in 1815. At the eve of the War of Independence, the ethnic movement had reached a peak with an almost obsessive use of Greek terms and an ancestor obsession and worship of Classical antiquity. The War of Independence was preceded by an event in March 1821, when Alexander Ypsilantis, a member of the Philiki Etaireia (the Friendly Society) launched a small army across the river Pruth in order to destroy the Muslim warlord Ali Pasha and by doing so “bring liberty to the Classical land of Greece”. However, Ypsilantis insurrection did not spread, and the War of Independence was only officially declared in the Peloponnesse on March 25. Because of the developing tensions amongst different Greek fractions, which resulted in two consecutive civil wars and affected trading interests of the Great Powers, the latter –after years of negotiation– decided to intervene in the conflict. And so, British, French and Russian fleets destroyed the Turco-Egyptian fleet in the Battle of Navarino in October 1827, which marked the end of the Tourkokratia, but also the beginning of a new Greek Kingdom, which had, by intervention of the Great Powers, lost its independency before it even existed. Something Greece would be reminded to for many more years to come.

1831-1922: The Great Idea & National Schism
In May 1832, Britain, France, Russia and Bavaria signed a treaty that settled the terms under which King Otto, the choice of the Powers and the son of King Ludwig I of Bavaria, was to accept the throne.
With this treaty, Greece was placed under the “Protecting Powers”. Since Greece was a new state, it had to create a basic infrastructure, for previously there never existed one. Even though the prosecution of the war over a period of almost ten years helped the establishment of a sense of nationhood move beyond the intelligentsia and those who were involved in the prosecution of the war, the need for the creation of a shared sense of Greek identity still existed, for there had to be constructed a nation as well as a state. Because King Otto was a minor until 1835, Greece was governed by three Bavarians, who were little sensitive towards Greek tradition. These Bavarians fashioned Greece after western European models and established Athens as capital of the Kingdom in 1834. With this they portrayed an obvious cultural orientation towards the Classical past. With the founding of the University in 1837, this was seen as the “power-house” of the attempt to re-Hellenize the unredeemed Greek populations of the Ottoman Empire: Since the former Ottoman Greece was almost thrice as big as the Greek Kingdom, many “former Greeks” now lived outside the borders. This eventually led to the irredentist Megali Idea. This term was first introduced by Ioannis Kolettis in 1844; he believed that not only the autochtons –the inhabitants of the kingdom– were Greeks, but also the heterochtons (the inhabitants of all areas that were associated with the history of Greece) were Greek.

Because of discontent with King Otto, who was a catholic and off course not himself a Greek, a military intervention took place in 1843 and eventually King Otto was overthrown by the Athens garrison in 1862, after which ‘King George I of the Hellenes’, a Danish royal member, took the throne. Because of the popularity of the new king (who was much more pro-Britain than King Otto had been), Britain yielded the Ionian Islands to Greece. This added some quarter million people to the population and brought into the kingdom a region which had much more been under western influence than any other part of Greece. In the political system there was a progress towards a modernization at the end of the 19th century. The turning point of this modernization came in 1875 with the introduction of the majority system. The first to win under this majority system was Kharilaos Trikoupis’ New Party. This New Party had a westernizing tendency and aimed to stabilize the politics and economics of Greece. In order to do this however, tax raises were inevitable. This caused the rise of Deliyannis, a more flamboyant and populist politician whose aim was to establish a “Greater Greece”. However, his belligerence eventually caused the defeat in the thirty-day war with Turkey in 1897. This war was the consequence of amongst others a revolt on Crete in the mid-1890’s, which was heavily supported by the nationalist of the National Society. Despite the refusal of the Powers to help Greece in this attempt to take over Crete, Deliyannis sent ships and troops to the island in 1897 as a response to popular pressure. This attempt ended in a crushing defeat.

After 1897 a period of introspection and self-doubt started. Later in the century efforts from within the kingdom were made to create a sense of Hellenic identity amongst the Greek populations in Asia Minor. In the beginning of the 20th century a period of restoration of self-confidence came into existence. This restoration was primarily due to Eleftherios Venizelos. This very capable politician was seen as the forefront of the national political stage, because of the Goudi coup in 1909 which caused the enosis of Crete with Greece. His politics aimed for an economical and political modernization and an aggressive pursuit of the Great Idea. With this he brought optimism and a new sense of national unity into the Greek society in a period of successive wars in the area. In 1912 the Balkan Allies or Balkan League (Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Montenegro) declared war against the Ottoman Empire and with the Treaty of London of May 1913, the Turks recognized the territorial gains of these Balkan allies. With this, Greece added some 70 percent to its land area (however, by no means all the inhabitants of these lands were Greeks). This made that Greece had become a
significant Mediterranean power by 1913 and with that, the Great Idea was now no more a fantasy, but a realistic goal.

During World War I, however, the Great Idea turned from a unifying ideal into a source of the Ethnikos Dikhasmos (National Schism). This division in the Greek society was basically between supporters of the monarchy and supporters of the democracy, started by a quarrel between King Constantine and Venizelos over participation in World War I (this is why it is also called a division between Venizelists and Anti-Venizelists). Since Venizelos was an advocate of the Great Idea and King Constantine aimed for a “small but honorable Greece”, the elections in 1915 reflected the war-weariness and the feelings of humiliation at the meddling of the Powers in the country’s internal affairs that lived amongst the Greek society, for Venizelos was defeated by the King despite all his popularity. Despite the fact that the King advocated a “small but honorable Greece”, he continued the campaign in Asia Minor. Because of this, Greece lost the support of its allies, for they all declared their strict neutrality in April 1921. In March 1922, the Greeks were standing at the edge of accepting a British proposal which would establish a compromise peace based on the withdrawal of their forces and the establishment of a League of Nations protectorate over the Greeks of Asia Minor, when the Turks attacked on August 26. Some 30,000 Greek and Armenian Christians were massacred.

1923-1949: The consequences of the Catastrophe and the occupation

The defeat at Asia Minor meant the end of the Great Idea and the expansion in the East. The loss of the hope that came with the Great Idea was accompanied by a feeling of abandonment by the allies in the hour of Greece’s greatest need. Like after many wars, someone had to be blamed and justice had to be done to them. This resulted in the “Trial of Six”, in which six of the accused politicians and soldiers were executed by firing squad. Soon after however, the realization rose that peace could only be accomplished by a negotiated settlement with the Turkish republic. For this purpose, Greece trusted the diplomatic finesse of Venizelos. He attended the conference where the Treaty of Lausanne was signed: A treaty which secured the exchange of populations on the bases of religion instead of language or national consciousness of the Greeks and Turks in question. As a consequence of this, many of the refugees only knew Turkish, which caused them to be discriminated against. Besides this, many Anatolian Greeks from the great Ottoman cities looked down upon the provincial inhabitants of the “old” Greece; palaiologos. Because of these discriminations and the refugees’ khamenes patrides (nostalgia for their homelands), it took them decades to be brought into mainstream society. The Treaty of Lausanne caused Greece to contain almost all of the Greek populations within the boundaries of the Greek state.

In 1924 Greece existed under a military dictatorship led by General Pangalos. This dictatorship was overthrown in 1926 by a military coup after which elections were held and an “ecumenical” government (existing of members from Venizelist and anti-Venizelist blocs) was formed. Under a majority system Venizelos became prime minister in 1928. In this period of the post-Russian revolution in which the polarization between the communists and the right-wing had started, Venizelos’ politics had become much more conservative and aimed at the communists. One of his main goals was the improvement of relationships with the neighboring countries, goals he was able to fulfill with the establishment of treaties of friendship with Yugoslavia and Italy and by improving relationships with Bulgaria and Albania. One of Venizelos’ highest achievements was the reconciliation with Turkey at the Ankara Convention of 1930. His policy resulted in the Balkan Pact in 1934, which was signed by Greece, Yugoslavia, Romania and Turkey. In 1932 another period of political instability surfaced, which resulted in the Metaxas dictatorship in 1936. Under this
dictatorship, Metaxas tried to combine the Pagan values of ancient Greece (especially those of Sparta) with the Christian values of the Byzantine Empire in order to create the “Third Hellenic Civilization”. When Greece was at war with Italy in 1940, Metaxas rose up against Italy, with which he captured the national mood and caused a great wave of national exaltation. And even though in April 1940 Athens had fallen into German hands and by 1941 Greece was under German, Bulgarian and Italian occupation, not even a year later (May 1941) the German Swastika was already torn down from the Acropolis again. This showed the Greek will to resist, which was also visible in multiple organized forms –in which the by then highly polarized struggle between leftists and rightist is reflected: The National Liberation Front (EAM, which was a communist movement), with the National People’s Liberation Army (ELAS) as its military arm and the non-communist National Republican Greek League (EDES). All these organizations had in common a shared antipathy towards King George, who they blamed for the Metaxas dictatorship and the occupation (since King George had chosen Metaxas as his successor). With this will to resist, Greece was responsible for one of the most spectacular achievements of resistance in Europe: The destruction of the Gorgopotamos viaduct, which carried the Salonica-Athens railway line. The resistance groupings that stood up against their oppressors, soon turned on each other as the old quarrel between supporters of the republic and the monarchy was overlaid by a much more devastating quarrel between communist and anti-communists. This was what caused the Greek Civil War, the beginning of which was marked by the attacking of EDES by ELAS in October 1943. This civil war continued after the liberation and was accompanied by heavy governmental instability. With the help of new patron the United States of America, whose anti-communist politics were easily reconciled with those of Greece in the 1940’s and who took the place of the old patron Britain after heavily deteriorating relationships, the communist were defeated under the military rule of General Papagos in the summer of 1949.

**1950-1974: The legacy of the civil war**

From 1952 on, a period of right-winged rule started, which marked the beginning of a 20-year period of remarkable monetary stability and economical growth. After the war Greek merchant marine had become the largest of the world and with the take-off of tourism in the 1950’s –by the improved living standards in western Europe and the development of mass-air travel– the impact on Greece’s mores and customs were apparent. In 1952, Greece and Turkey admitted to the NATO alliance. The shared perceptions of a common enemy during the 1940’s had improved the relations between the two countries. However, the Balkan Pact soon disintegrated; with the loss off this common external danger, the old quarrels rose again. And after these old struggles were translated in violent riots against the Greek minority in Istanbul in September 1955, the situation between Greece and Turkey was back to its old form. After a growing crisis in Cyprus, the Cyprus settlement of 1960 made Cyprus an independent republic with the British Commonwealth, wherein Greece and Turkey were entitled to station small military contingents.

One of Prime Minister Konstantinos Karamanlis’ main aims was to legitimize Greece’s still somewhat uncertain European identity by grasping more firmly onto the western alliance. One of the ways to help achieve this was a membership to the European Economic Community. The association agreement to this membership was signed in 1961, with which Greece would become a member in 1984. This agreement was signed in the background of continuing struggles in Cyprus, where in December 1963 a direct threat of Turkish intervention occurred because president Makarios wanted the rights of the Turkish Cypriots to be reduced. In this year Georgios Papandreou took Karamanlis’ place as prime minister and with this he entered a period of political crisis. From 1967 to 1974,
Greece was governed by a military dictatorship which had the self-proclaimed mission to defend the traditional values of the “Helleno-Christian civilization”, in order to defend Greece from the western influences on Greek society and economy. This period of dictatorship recalled the Metaxas regime, including its hostility towards communists. The dictatorship of Colonels Papadopoulos, Pattakos and Brigadier Ioannidis was a highly unpopular regime and its brutal and absurd ways caused many hostile comments abroad and much domestic resistance (which was often brutally ended by a harsh and efficient security apparatus). In 1973, the students took the lead in the opposition against the regime and in November 1973, they occupied the Athens Polytechnic. The military regime reacted with violence, causing multiple deaths. On this, an even harder military interference followed, which was led by Dimitrios Ioannidis and which had General Phaidon Gizikis installed as president. This change within the junta coincided with sudden deteriorating relations with Turkey, mainly caused by the claiming of oil rights in the Aegean Sea. Besides this deteriorating relationship, the relation between the Ioannidis regime and the president of Cyprus, Makarios worsened because the Ioannidis regime forced Makarios to accept Athens as the “national centre” of Hellenism. When Makarios refused to do so, Ioannidis performed a coup to remove Makarios, after which he aimed for a nationalist triumph by joining Cyprus and Greece. In fear of this enosis Turkey invaded Cyprus on 20 July 1974. The Greek military refused to cooperate in the war Ioannidis wanted to start with Turkey in reaction to the Cyprus invasion, which caused the Ioannidis regime to deteriorate because of the loss of support. The return of president Karamanlis was joined with a, up till this time, unmatched jubilation, but the invasion did cause the Turks to constitute the zone along the north coast as ‘the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus’, which has remained a source of friction between Greece and Turkey since then.

1974-1990: The consolidation of democracy and the populist decade

The military dictatorship and the Cyprus disaster had led to a dent in the confidence in the anti-communists, the pro-American and the pro-NATO that existed in the 1950’s and 1960’s. This was paired with an upsurge in anti-American sentiment, on which president Karamanlis reacted with a withdrawal from Greece from the military wing of the NATO alliance and the questioning of the future of the US bases on Cyprus. The elections in 1974, in which Karamanlis was elected as president, were the first in which a choice could be made out of the whole range of the political spectrum; from the communists to the authoritarian right. At this election, an interesting new political formation occurred; the Pan-Hellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK), led by Andreas Papandreou (son of Liberal and Venizelist Georgios Papandreou). This party gained a considerable 14 per cent of the votes in the elections. A sizeable number of voters was clearly attracted by the harnessing of nationalism by its populist slogan: ‘National Independence, Popular sovereignty, Social Liberation and Democratic Structures’. In the first period of his presidency, Karamanlis changed the constitution from a dictatorship to a democracy after a referendum on this subject. With this change, Greece was finally freed from the monarchy and with that, the direct political influence of the Great Powers. This mingling was the price Greece had to pay for its independence and it has been the source of political instability for a period of thirty years after the National Schism of World War I.

The tensions between Greece and Turkey continued in quarrels about air-control and the borders of the coastal waters of the islands (the Aegean dispute). The détente between the Super Powers lessened the fear of the communist neighbors of the two countries and with this the source of their good relations was removed. Like before, Karamanlis’ aim was still to align Greece more closely with the western society by accelerating the accession of Greece into the European
Community. The 1961 treaty of association gave the possibility for accession in 1984, but faster accession would mean better relations with Europe, which would compensate for the deteriorating relationship with traditional patron USA and would protect Greece against Turkey and safeguard its newly established democratic institutions. The European Community in Brussels doubted the accession of Greece because of its weak economics, but Karamanlis exploited feelings of guilt by Europe’s inertia during the dictatorship and soon the members of the European Community hailed Greece as Europe’s foundation of civilization and full membership was granted in 1981.

The popularity of Papandreou’s PASOK, which was due to the party’s advocacy of nationalism in combination with a socialist rhetoric and a very good nationwide democratic, organizational structure, made Karamanlis’ New Democracy fall behind in its effort to modernize and democratize his party’s structure. In 1981 this led to a massive win for PASOK. As prime minister, Papandreou implemented a serious number of reforms; (amongst others) the adoption of the monotoniko; a drastic simplifying single accent system in the written language, the introduction of civil marriage (under heavy opposition of the church) and he made attempts to bring about administrative decentralization. The ‘national proud’ stance of PASOK was in heavy contrast with its conservative predecessors, which caused Papandreou’s party to break multiple ranks with Greece’s European partners. Meanwhile, in 1983 the relations with Turkey once again worsened after the declaration of an independent ‘Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’ by a Turkish Cypriot assembly – which was only formally recognized by Turkey and followed the failed declaration of the ‘Turkish Federative State of Cyprus, which was (also) declined by the Republic of Cyprus, the United Nations and the international community. In the elections of 1985, PASOK won again, but this time the party was forced to introduce a tough austerity programme which had to be supported by a emergency EC loan. This was the cause of major unrest and strikes and marked the beginning of a steadily deteriorating economical situation. In 1988 there was a historical breakthrough in relations between Greece and Turkey which was marked by the signing of the Davos agreement (the ‘no war’ agreement). Not unlike the other breakthroughs, this one did not last long. Meanwhile, the accumulation of (allegations of) scandals in the course of 1989 caused the PASOK government to fall in 1990. Subsequently, while all around eastern Europe communism was rejected, they entered the government in Greece. Three elections within a year followed and after the last election Karamanlis became president again with Mitsotakis as prime minister.

1990-
Mitzotakis began his political term with an attempt to improve the relations with the United States through a defense cooperation in 1990. This cooperation regulated the operation at the US bases on Greek grounds for the next eight years. From 1991-1992 he sought to improve the relation with Turkey by attempts to revive the Davos agreement. These attempts failed however, because no progress had been made in the Cyprus question and the Turkish government seemed to be unprepared to make concessions on this matter. With the secession of Croatia and Slovenia in 1991, the disintegration of Yugoslavia began. Subsequently a great nationalistic issue came into existence; the ‘Macedonia naming-dispute’ emerged in 1992 with the declaration of independence of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia in September 1991. The international recognition of the Republic was strongly opposed by Greece and resulted in the “Rally for Macedonia”, in which about a million Greek Macedonians protested against the use of the name ‘Macedonia’ in Thessaloniki in 1992. Their main objective was the removal of the name Macedonia, for “Macedonia is Greek” (Roudometof 2002, 32). The naming dispute was never really resolved and however the name Macedonia is in use,
the name FYROM (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) is the common name used in countries that do not recognize the ‘Republic of Macedonia’ (amongst which are –besides Greece and Cyprus– Australia, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain and Portugal). After the elections of 1993, which was won by PASOK, Mitzotakis resigned and Papandreou became prime minister again. When he placed an embargo on Skopje in 1994, by obstructing all trade to and from Skopje that went through the port of Thessaloniki, the Macedonian dispute lit up again. This embargo was met by massive protest in western mass media and a growing sympathy for FYROM. Papandreou’s demand was, amongst others, that the Macedonian star would be removed from the FYROM flag (Pantzou 2009, 183).

In 1995 Greece lifted its objections against Turkey entering the European Community and relations with Greece’s northern neighbors were improved considerably. After the elections of 1996, in which Kostas Simitis had become prime minister, Greek politics was primarily characterized by Simitis’ philosophy of eksynchronismo (modernization). When in 2000 Simitis’ wanted the “Religion” part of the ID cards removed, this caused a dispute between him and the Archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church, Christodoulos. This led to massive demonstrations and a referendum about the subject, which resulted in the removal of the “Religious identity” from the ID card. Even though Simitis –much out of line with the PASOK tradition– moved away from Orthodox norms and had a more tempered nationalistic stance in the Cyprus and Macedonia disputes, his supporters saw his eksynchronismos as a positive movement in Greek society. It was also under his government that Greece was accepted into the Economic and Monetary Union in 2000. In the following period under prime minister Kostas Karamanlis (2004-2009), the political debate was dominated by the 2004 Summer Olympics and the massive public debt (of which the first of course emphasized the latter). And this remained the biggest issue in George A. Papandreou’s current government.

2.2 Changing attitudes towards the past
-What main events triggered nationalism and/or reflected nationalistic feelings in Greek history?
-How have the (Greek) attitudes towards the Greek past developed through time?

The movement towards an ethnic Greek consciousness

The Greek Enlightenment is often seen as the movement in which Greece started to reflect upon its own “national” identity. This Enlightenment was an ideological phenomenon within which the focus was laid on Greece’s Classical antiquity and in which Greece created a specifically Greek identity instead of the Orthodox identity that had existed in Greece up to this point. In this movement the emphasis on the study of Classics in schools rose and the interest in ancient Greek literature and ancient monuments grew. This phenomenon appeared throughout the late 18th and the early 19th century (1750-1820) (Voutsaki 2003, 232). In general there was little interest in the material remains of the past in Greece in the 15th and 16th century. However, Ciriaco of Ancona already gave a fundamental role to the material remains in this time in his –only later widely known– study of the Greek antiquity (Anthanassopoulos 2002, 278). With this, Greece was one of the first nations in the Balkan that established a direct link between archaeological remains and nationality. Ancona’s line of work was picked up again only in the 17th century, where the scholars Spon and Wheeler continued the study of antiquities in the developing effort to integrate ancient Greece into Europe (Anthanassopoulos 2002, 278). The emergence of the prosperous Greek mercantile class and the Greek dominance of the imperial trade at the end of the 18th century boosted the intellectual revival.

2 See paragraph 1.3 for Kitromilides’ explanation of pre-nation nationalism
This enabled young Greeks to study in universities of western Europe, where they came into contact with the ideas of the Enlightenment, of the French Revolution and of romantic nationalism and made them aware of the importance of Greece to their fellow European students. This rise of mercantilism occurred more or less simultaneous with the rise of the concept of Europe and it is in the mid-18th century the shift from Rome to Greece occurs; whereas up to the 18th century Europeans regarded their heritage to be Roman and Christian, in the mid-18th century Hellenism rose and an idealized Greece became the starting point of European identity (Athanassopoulos 2002, 279). This shift brought forth an interest in Greek Antiquity and the ensuing ‘Grand Tour’, which brought antiquarians and scholars to the eastern Mediterranean. As a consequence of this interest in Classical antiquity, the European collections and what is called “the Greek Dilemma” started. The search for the origins of western uniqueness, which inspired the new interest in European archaeological remains in the 18th century, marked a turning point in Greek ethnic identity; Greece became the origins of Europe and central in defining European identity (Athanassopoulos 2002, 279).

This movement towards an ethnic consciousness during the late 18th and early 19th century, with the Classical past as a binding factor, ultimately led to the outbreak of the War of Independence in 1822. This war was not only a fight for freedom from the Ottoman dominance, but also a fight for the resurrection of the ancient Greek knowledge, morality and art. This vision was called Hellas (Herzfeld 1982, 3). To be a Hellene for the Greek meant to link oneself to what had been accomplished by the ancient Greek (Herzfeld 1982, 19). Not only was the Greek past the cause of the War of Independence, it was also the reason Greece had won it. This victory was to some extent thanks to the notion of Hellas, for Greece had received the help of the Great Powers because of Europeans linking themselves to ancient Greece: To be a European was to be a Hellene (Herzfeld 1982, 5). With this, the War of Independence led to a connection between modern and ancient Greece and to a connection between Greece and western Europe, but it also led to a detachment between Greece and the other Balkan nations (Pantzou 2009, 89). With the winning of the War of Independence in 1827, Greece became a monarchical and independent state under British, Russian and French guarantee. The level of independence was thus very relative and in fact the help of the Great Powers in the War of Independence, made Greece subjected to a Powers-chosen monarchical rule, which would become the basis of much political instability after World War I.

The construction of a nation and its identity

After the liberation from the Ottoman suppression with the help of the Great Powers in 1827, the biggest concern for the Greek was how to define their national identity in this new found freedom; how to establish a uniform national identity. Since Ottoman Greece had been almost thrice as big as the Greek Kingdom, many Greek now lived outside the borders of the Kingdom. This diaspora caused the irredentist Megali Idea. Even though this term was officially introduced in Kolettis speech in 1844, it had been previously used by Alexander Soutsos in one of his poems in 1843. The poet speaks of “a great idea that might come to the nation, and idea which would involve reclaiming its ancestral inheritance, whose specific form is described as the Comnenian Empire” (Kitromilides 1998, 27). Soutsos thus connects the term with the Byzantine Empire. However, Kolettis uses the term in a quite different way; in his speech the term is about the unity of the Greek nation, living both inside and outside the borders of the Greek Kingdom (Kitromilides 1998, 27). Under the influence of the Bavarian government Athens had to undergo a major transformation in order to become the new capital of Greece; Athens had to reflect the national identity of Greece, so it had to be transformed into a city that contained all the beauty and prestige of the Golden Era, retained in the monuments
and buildings of the Classical period. In order to achieve this, the remains from other periods had to be removed. The architects Kleanthes and Schaubert, who developed the first plan for Athens, wanted to retain the monuments of many different periods. However, this plan was later modified by von Klenze; a German architect who came to Athens at the start of the process in 1834 (Athanassopoulos 2002, 294). In his plan Klenze recommended the Classical monuments to be cleansed from the post-Classical remains. In this process not all the Turkish, Frankish and Byzantine monuments and buildings were removed, because of resistance by the Athenian citizens, but the Classical remains did become more and more isolated from the surroundings of everyday life, thereby becoming increasingly disconnected from their social environment and were placed onto an “unreachable pedestal” (Athanassopoulos 2002, 283; 299).

In the first years after the liberation, what is called “the Fallmerayer incident” occurred (Voutsaki 2003, 238). In his Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea während des Mittelalters, published in 1830, Fallmerayer stated anti-Hellas ideas and in this he denied the Greeks “their claim to descent from the ancient Hellenes” (Herzfeld 1982, 75). With this Fallmerayer hit a nerve, for in the first decades of Greek independence the present-past relationship involved a massive time-gap: the national resurrection of the 1821 revolution and the formation of the Greek state was Greece’s present and its past was the Classical antiquity (Liakos 2008, 201). With this time-gap in mind, Fallmerayer’s claims provoked an enormous amount of Greek scholars’ attempts to disprove his theories, non-Greek critiques to his work and discussions and debates in newspapers (Hamilakis 2007, 115). Besides these reactions an upsurge of folklore studies came into existence. Sutton (1998) suggests that it was perhaps the fact that the Hellenic past had been so often at stake that caused the “attempt to build a culture and a national identity in which individual actions and behaviors were legitimate only insofar as they could be related to similar behaviors in the Classical Hellenic Greece of more than twenty centuries before” (Sutton 1998, 5). An interesting consequence of these reactions was the affiliation of Byzantium in the Greek nationality (Hamilakis 2007, 115). The biggest contributor to this phenomenon was Konstantinos Papparigopoulos. In his book The History of the Hellenic Nation, consisting out of five volumes (1860-1874), he created a tripartite schedule which showed the continuity through time from the Classical period, through the Byzantine era to the modern Greek state (Voutsaki 2002, 242-243). In Greek scholarship his work is considered to be a turning point for modern Greek historical thought and for modern Greek identity in general (Kotsakis 1998, 51). Papparigopoulos’ work has a clearly ethnogenetic flavor: in his work Greek society perceives itself as a “perfect totality in space and time” through an ethnic link, creating an uninterrupted sequence in which the past produces a pathway for the present and future, thus creating “the narritative of nationality” (Kotsakis 1998, 51). The folklorist/historian Zambelios also contributed to the incorporation of Byzantium into the Greek history and thus the filling of the time-gap in Greek history by introducing his term ellinohristianikos (Helleno-Christian) in 1852, with which he denoted “an entity resulting from the fusion between Classical Hellenism and Orthodox Christianity” (Hamilakis 2007, 116; Huxley 1998, 18).

The popularity of Papparigopoulos’ works\(^3\) proves that the History of the Greek Nation responded to “profound needs and cravings in Greek society and collective consciousness” existing in society since the liberation of Greece (Kitromilides 1998, 30-31). Without intention, Papparigopoulos created an image of the Byzantine Empire as it was under the Macedonian and Comnenian dynasties and turned this into a teleology for the Greek state. This “ideal territorial and geographical model”

\(^3\) Proven by the evidence assembled in Dimaras’ monograph Paparrigopoulos
was instrumental in the late 19th century political thought, for it was deemed to be a “pointer to the future destiny and mission of Greece” (Kitromilides 1998, 31). International crises like the Crimean War and the confrontation with Bulgarian nationalism (1870-) had heated up the public debate about issues like the reconquest of Constantinople, the dream of a larger Greek state in the Balkans and the recreation of a ‘Greek Empire’, but with intellectual work like that of Paparrigopoulos, a clear goal was set out to which Greek state and society could strive (Kitromilides 1998, 31). In this political realm, the Great Idea can be seen as an ideology which is to a large extend based on a politically manipulated view on Paparrigopoulos’ historical works. The “political” Great Idea primarily aimed to expand the Greek state and model it after the Byzantine Empire (Kitromilides 1998, 33). This “Byzantine Idea” turned out to be short-lived for it died together with its expansion drifts and the Megali Idea’s active folklore in the Catastrophe; the defeat of Asia Minor in 1922.

The threat of 20th century external influences: Post-war population exchange and immigration, the take-off of tourism and the integration into the European Union

The Treaty of Lausanne, signed in 1923, caused the transfer of some 380,000 Muslims to Turkey and approximately 1,100,000 Greeks to leave their homelands in Asia Minor. 600,000 of these Greeks lived in Greek Macedonia (Finney 2003, 89). This exchange, in combination with the exchange between Greece and Bulgaria in 1919, which caused about 55,000 “Bulgarians” to move to Bulgaria and 30,000 Greeks to Greece (plus some 70,000 unofficial emigrants) posed a serious problem for the Greek national history; the constitution of the population was altered so drastically that an ethnic continuity can not be justified and even though well-Hellenized Macedonians might have come to speak and act Greek, they did not simply turn Greek (Finney 2003, 89-90). Finney (2003) argues that this problem is mostly either ignored or dealt with by crude and ungrounded attempts to prove the Hellenic character of ancient Macedonians (Finney 2003, 89). During and after the Civil War (1946-1949) political refugees fled Greece. Many of these refugees were members or sympathizers of the communist forces that were defeated during the Civil War. Also many Slav-Macedonians fled the country in what is called “The Exodus of Macedonians from Greece” (Koliopoulos 1997, 48). Additional to this stream of refugees there occurred a big emigration from the countryside to the city, in which twelve per cent of the population moved to the city from 1951-1980. This caused the abandonment of many villages and major construction works in the cities.

Another factor which had a huge impact on Greece’s appearance was the take-off of tourism in the 1950’s. In general tourism tends to have a great impact on a country’s culture because heritage then serves different users, who impute different meanings upon it. “The very commodification [of heritage] can divide groups of heritage consumers” (Asworth & Howard, 1999, 94). Because of the social changes, tourism brings forth a transformation of cultural meaning, for what was before of cultural importance for indigenous people will (often) have to be altered in a way so that it becomes of cultural importance to the tourist. In this way it carries multiple meanings; the event loses some of its original meaning by turning it in to a tourist product (Hall 1994, 182). This tourist view, which is also reflected in the Greek cinema in the 1950’s and 1960’s, fuelled the idealized and “exotic” image of Greece. In this tourist view, which thus is a continuation of the idealized image Europe had imposed upon Greece since the Renaissance, Greek heritage, mores and costumes are reduced into a form of primitiveness that devalues the integrity of modern Greece and places the country low in the global hierarchy of power (Zacharia 2008, 334). According to Zacharia (2008), the Colonels of the military regime of 1967-1974 even embraced this tourist myth in order to gain popularity amongst the society and please the American patrons (Zacharia 2008, 334).
A quote from one of the brigadiers, Stylianos Pattakos (1968), demonstrates the means in which the regime uses this tourist myth in order to “defended the traditional values of ‘Helleno-Christian civilization’": “Young people of Greece [...] You have enfolded Greece in your breasts and your creed is the meaning of sacrifice, from the time of the ‘Come and get them’ of Leonidas, later of the ‘I shall not give you the City’ of Constantine Palaiologos, of the ‘No’ of Metaxas and, finally, of the ‘Halt or I shoot’ of 21 April 1967 [...] Today’s ceremony is a re-baptism in the well springs of ancestral tradition; an expression of the national belief that the race of the Greeks is the greatest and best under the sun” (Clogg 1992, 163-164).

The incorporation of Greece into the European Union in 1981 had a great effect on the Greek national identity, for this was the ultimate confrontation with the duality of Greece; the Greece that holds the “cultural ancestors who laid the foundations of European civilization” and the Greece that clings to its own cultural and national features that differentiates the country from the rest of Europe in times of threatening homogenization brought upon by European integration (Mackridge 2008, 297). With this integration into the European Union, Greece became more vulnerable to multiculturalism, which could be a threat to the homogeneous Greek society for which it always fought very hard (Mackridge 2008, 317). A movement which can be detected in reaction to this external threat is the reaffirmation of Greece with its neighboring countries in eastern Europe. Even though this is not a clearly visible trend, there are small things that direct towards Greece confirming more its “easterness”, its exoticness and with that its distinction from the western European cultures. An example that underlines this notion is the importance of folk culture. In modern Greek society, dance and music are some of the most important features of Greek identity. Traditional Greek rhythms are still prominently present, which is demonstrated by the current Greek mainstream genre Contemporary (or Modern) Laikó, in which many traditional folk rhythms and the traditional bouzouki occur. Also traditional folk dances are still performed on many occasions (Mackridge 2008, 318). The modern Greek folk music, according to Randel (2003), bears similarities to the music of Greece’s Balkan and Eastern Mediterranean neighbors (Randel 2003, 362). And even though the continuation of the traditional folk rhythms and dances into modern Greece bears witness to the importance of the continuation of Greek cultural history, this promotion of folk culture also aligns Greece more with Eastern European cultures then with the cultures of the European Union (Mackridge 2008, 318). Furthermore, with the first series of Euro-value stamps in 2002, Greece promoted the variety within Greek culture by depicting a different performance of a folk dance on each stamp, thus emphasizing the differences within folk tradition in the various regions of Greece. This is an interesting phenomenon in a society that usually places the emphasis on its homogeneity (Mackridge 2008, 317). With the introduction of the Euro coin in 2002, an opportunity occurred for every participating country to represent its nation with the images that would be depicted on the country’s coins. Whereas before Greece’s drachma had been adorning the Macedonian sun, the new Euro coins became to depict two ancient symbols, three historical figures and three ships –which symbolize the importance and continuity of Greek seafaring culture throughout Greece’s history (Mackridge 2008, 313-315). Besides restraining from the use of the contested Macedonian symbol, Greece also avoided the use of Christian symbols, which – contradictory to the former statement of Greece more resembling more its Balkan neighbors– can be perceived as an attempt of Greece to “be more European”, for they were the only EU member at that time whose population adhered mostly to Orthodox Christianity (Zacharia 2008, 337; Mackridge 2008, 298).
The ongoing Macedonian Conflict

The Treaty of London, signed in 1913, in which the Turks recognized the territorial gains of the Balkan Allies, caused (amongst others things) the incorporation of Macedonia into the Greek state. Since this incorporation, there have been attempts to transform the diverse population of Southern Macedonia into a pure Greek unity by policies of forced Hellenization (Danforth 2003, 215). These policies first involved exchanges of populations and the removal of Slavic personal and place names. However, under the Metaxas dictatorship (1936-1941) the Slavic-speaking population that identified itself as Macedonian instead of Greek, was severely repressed. This policy of Hellenization continued under the conservative Greek governments and one of the attempts to assimilate the Macedonians in Greece was the administration of the “language oaths”, which made Macedonians pledge never to speak their “Slavic dialect” and to only speak Greek from then on (Danforth 2003, 215). Over all this policy of Hellanization proved to be quite successful; the majority of the Slavic-speaking population of Northern Greece came to identify themselves as Greeks. However, like is often the case with attempts of forced assimilation, the Greek policy also had unintended side-effects: A small group of Northern Macedonians had developed a Macedonian national identity. In this the exclusion of people from the nation’s community, contributed to the formation of the kind of minorities the policy initially tried to prevent (Danforth 2003, 215).

A similar forced assimilation carried out by the Bulgarian rule in Macedonia in the 1940’s is believed to be the root cause of the modern Macedonian crisis (Finney 2003, 90). This Bulgarian rule – which claimed Macedonia after the dismembering of the Yugoslav kingdom by the Axis powers in 1941– did everything it could to “Bulgarise” the inhabitants of Macedonia in its communist-inspired ethnogenesis of Yugoslav Macedonia (Finney 2003, 90; Phillips 2004, 32). The current Macedonian problem started in 1992 with the “Macedonian naming-dispute” –the dispute over the removal of the ‘Macedonia’ in the ‘Socialist Republic of Macedonia’. This dispute was not simply a struggle over a name; it was a confirmation of suspicions. The use of a name often implies material motives and this suspicion was confirmed with the maps printed by FYROM nationalists showing the “Republic of Macedonia” extending down to the Aegean (Sutton 1998, 190). With this in mind, the name not just reflected the current situation, but implied calculations of future possibilities. Also, Macedonian nationalists in Australia (and elsewhere in the diaspora) laid claims to be the descendants of Philip of Macedon, and with this view being adopted after the independence, the Macedonian Conflict created an open link between the present and the past (Phillips 2004, 43; Pantzou 2009, 185). In this, the heritage of the region has been used as a validation of theories and especially the findings at Vergina, including the tomb of Phillip II, brought forth a national political struggle in which once again Greek scholars “felt they had to deal with questions of ethnicity as they had done in the 19th century when Fallmereyer had challenged the continuity of Greek history” (Kotsakis 1998, 44). The Vergina Star played an explicitly important role in the Macedonian Conflict, for it became of importance for both Greeks and Slavic-Macedonians. As a Greek symbol of “national struggle and of Hellenism” it became more and more linked with the Macedonian past from the 1990’s onwards, which made this conflict not just about a name and a star, but an “assumed attack on the Greek nation” (Pantzou 2009, 185-186).

Modern Greek society

In the early 1990’s, Western societies came to realize the importance and effects of nationalism. This development coincided with the manifestation of the links between archaeology, archaeological material and sites and nationalism and the studying of this link grew into an academic subject
This resulted in the creation of university courses (in Western Europe) and the publication of the results of these new studies (Hamilakis 2007, 12-13). In Greece this led to a movement away from the “exceptionalism” —“the claim that the nation is built upon unique foundations”— which had dominated Greek nationalism since the end of the 19th century (Beaton 2009, 6). These studies “of the growth of Greek nationalism out of the French and Greek Enlightenment” have brought forth many modern political theories, which were unable to influence the field of study on an international level, because of the Greek language barrier (Beaton 2009, 6). It is only since the last thirty years this barrier has been lifted by the translation of scholarly books into modern Greek and English (Beaton 2009, 6; Agapitos 1998, 64). In these years scholarly work increasingly got published by large publishing houses, whereas before this field of work was only being published in scholarly circles. This development naturally made these works accessible to a broader public and some of these political theories provoked national resistance, for many of these studies challenge the constructed nature of the modern Greek sense of the past.

It is from this time onwards the historical viewpoint (primarily in the academic world) changed; modern Greece was no longer considered to be a natural continuation of the Hellenic past and the field of study shifted more towards the questioning of how this historical consciousness was shaped and how it is it works so well for the Greek national identity (Liakos 2008, 219). But even though the continuation of the Greek race might no longer be an unquestioned and widely accepted theory, it is still the ancient Greek history that brings feelings of national pride to the modern Greeks and the notion of continuity of the Hellenic nation is still emphasized in modern Greek society in for example the opening ceremony of the Athens Olympics in 2004 (Liakos 2008, 219; Beaton 2009, 5; Hamilakis 2007, 7). This importance of continuity is not unique to Greek society, since many philosophers have argued that a sense of historical continuity is crucial in the formation of personal identity and “a similar insistence on the diachronic preservation of key features also sustains collective identity claims” (Stewart 2008, 273). And because of the notion of “otherness” is of much more importance in the Balkans, which is mostly caused by ongoing “transnational politico-economic causes”, the construction of a nationalism (and thus having a sense of historical continuity) is of major importance for particularly Mediterranean nations (Sutton 1998, 179; Pantzou 2009, 83; Liakos 2002, 28). However, it might be suggested that the only reason for the highlighting (and attempt of refutation) of Greece’s claims on continuity is due to the fact that it is that same continuity the European Civilization has long been claiming to be part of. This once again highlights the duality Greece had to deal with throughout its entire history, and still deals with today; the making of Greece’s national identity was for a great deal influenced by the Renaissance-originated myth that “the Greeks were responsible for the revival of civilization in modern Europe”, and with that in mind, some might even argue that Greek national identity is a prefiguration of European identity, or in the words of Pierre de Bougainville: “Greece is a small universe and the history of Greece is an excellent summary of universal history” (Augustinos 2008; 188; Liakos 2008 212).

After the peak in the Greek national self-esteem that came with the Athens Olympics of 2004, the national pride has been in a downward spiral. The economic deterioration, the increasing political scandals and the general feelings of socio-political and institutional crisis spreading in Greek society ultimately peaked in the threat of marginalization within the Eurozone in the 2008-2009 global economic crisis (Pagoulatos & Yataganas 2010, 198). In this climate, the lowered expectations

---

4 The term as used by Pantzou (2009) as describing the hybrid identities in the Balkans: Their identities combine the elements of “others” and “self”, meaning that a great deal of what ones nationalism looks like is opposed to the nationalism of the “others” (the neighboring countries) (Pantzou 2009, 83)
that were due to Greece’s massive public debt, resulted in the deteriorating optimism amongst the Greek Europeanists and raised questions about future European integration (Pagoulatos & Yataganas 2010, 198). With Greece’s role in the European Union questioned and its value turned from being the “foundation of European society” into being an underdog in the European Union, once again the public intellectual debate was dominated by the “independence versus integration” and the “Greek national identity versus the European national identity” divide (Pagoulatos & Yataganas 2010, 201).

As mentioned before, at times of crisis Greece often turns to its Classical past, like it did when Greece was in financial distress in the Second World War and there were posters distributed that had to remind the rest of Europe and the western world about their great symbolic capital by depicting scenes from the Classical past in order to give them economic capital in exchange (Hamilakis & Yalouri 1996, 119). Greece has always worked hard to establish a homogenous nation in order to strengthen the continuity and therefore the national identity of the Greek race. However, since Greece currently finds itself in the process of becoming a heterogeneous society—because of increasing immigration from Balkan countries and the Westernizing influences of the European Union—Greeks seem to again (or better: Still) turn to their Classical past in order to hold on to their own national identity (Mackridge 2008, 317; Hamilakis 2007, 300).

2.3 Evaluation: Developments in the attitudes towards the Greek past

At the end of the Tourkokratia, late 18th century, an ethnic Greek identity constructed itself under the influence of the Greek Enlightenment. In this period, Classical antiquity became of great importance in the construction of a European identity. During the mid-18th century Hellenism rose and an idealized and glorified notion of Greece became the starting point of European identity. This marked a turning point in Greek ethnic identity and the will to be freed from the Ottoman dominance was fed by the notion of Hellas. With the winning of the War of Independence, modern Greece had become more attached to ancient Greece and this fed the connection between Greece and Europe. After the liberation, Greece became an independent state under a Powers-chosen the monarchical rule. In this period the Classical past that had created an ethnic bond in Greek society, led to the Megali Idea that aimed to unite all the Greeks that now lived outside the borders of the Greek Kingdom because of the diaspora. During this period a national Greek identity was built which was based purely on the Classical past. In order to build this nationality, the national topos had to be constructed in the likes of the Greek Golden Era, which is reflected in the purification activities that took place in Athens from the mid-19th century onwards. The notion that modern Greece was the present and its past was the Classical antiquity led to the realization that this massive time-gap in the narrative of Greek national history could not be justified. Papparigopoulos’ work the History of the Greek Nation solved this problem by integrating the Byzantine era into the Greek national history and with this he provided the Greek nation with a notion of continuity, which made Greek society a “perfect totality in space and time”.

However the Megali Idea was a great ideology in the construction of a nationality, it was also used as a justification of aggressive irredentism in the political realm. In this manipulated view the Megali Idea was seen as an ideology that aimed the Greek stated to be modeled after the Byzantine Empire. After the Catastrophe, the legacy of the Megali Idea had become the cause of a fundamental flaw in Greek politics which again resulted in a cycle of political rivalry and dictatorships. Since there were many uncertainties about what could properly be considered as Greek land and this therefore remained an unsettled aspect of the Megali Idea, it has been the cause of many territorial conflicts with Greece’s neighboring countries Albania, Serbia, Bulgaria and off course primarily Turkey.
Throughout Greek history, the nationalist cause—enosis (with Crete, Cyprus, the Ionian Islands and the Dodecanese or Macedonia) and the gaining back of “pieces of homeland”—was often deemed of more importance than the modernization and reformation of Greek internal affairs, and the aggressive nationalism of the Megali Idea still appears at times of crises in current Greek politics.

Besides these “external” conflicts, the Megali Idea also brought forth an ongoing internal strive which started with the formation of the Greek Kingdom and the implementation of a Powers-chosen monarchical rule, whose idea’s were in conflict with the irredentist idea’s of Venizelos. This division was reflected in society by the royalists versus the Venizelists. During the inter-war period, this division between Venizelists and Anti-Venizelists grew into a new form, which had its dividing line between nationalism and communism. Besides these external and internal conflicts, there was also a growth in external influences that caused the need for a homogenization of the Greek society. The population exchange between Turkey and Greece after the defeat of Asia Minor caused an ongoing Hellenization of the “new Greeks” and the growth of tourism and the incorporation of Greece into Europe had a considerable impact on the Greek national identity. The growing threat of Europeanization caused Greece to realign itself with its Balkan neighbors to a certain extend by emphasizing its “easternness”. However, the (primarily economic) importance of being part of Europe was also apparent, and with Greece’s current economic crisis causing its marginalization within the Eurozone, its symbolic capital is of great importance in the justification of Greece’s presence within the European Union.
Chapter 3
UNESCO World Heritage Listing

Research questions:
- How has UNESCO changed since its founding in ideology, methods, goals etc.
- How has the Greek World Heritage List developed through time?
- Is there a trend to be seen in either the dominance or the underexposure of heritage out of certain periods, or a certain type of monuments?

Abstract
UNESCO is an international organization concerned with the protection and conservation of endangered heritage sites all over the world. The selection of the sites that will be considered as “world heritage” is mainly executed on a national level, but the UNESCO World Heritage Committee decides (on the bases of the information provided by the experts of ICOMOS and IUCN, that examine the sites’ qualities) whether or not a site will be included on the World Heritage List. Throughout the years the organization has become bigger and bigger and with the increasing awareness of the economic benefit that comes with the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List, the list has increasingly come to serve as a “selection of display of top heritage tourism sites” (Boniface 2001 in: van der Aa 2005, 107). In order to unset the imbalance this “heritage competition” caused, UNESCO has been changing its policy in an attempt to include more heritage of underrepresented countries on the list.

3.1 Introduction UNESCO
Even though the Constitution of UNESCO was signed in 1945, the roots of this organization date back to just after World War I. With the ending of this war, the need for intellectual co-operations alongside the political activity of governments became apparent in order to prevent a war situation like that of the previous years and to maintain peace (Valderrama 1995, 22). Out of this need the League of Nations came into existence, which met for the first time in November 1920. Soon the League established an advisory organ; the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation (ICIC), founded in 1922. This organization aimed to promote cultural and intellectual exchange between scholars, scientists, researchers and other intellectuals. Amongst its members were prominent intellectuals like Albert Einstein, Marie Curie and Thomas Mann. After World War II, the tasks and materials from the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation were handed over to UNESCO. During World War II, in 1942, the Ministers of Education (or their representatives) of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Holland, Norway, Poland and Yugoslavia and France came together in the United Kingdom for the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education (CAME). This conference was held to create means of reconstructing the systems of the participating countries when peace would be restored. At the end of 1943, CAME decided to enlarge the Conference in order to set up an international organization. In a letter to the government of the USA, CAME stated that “the objective of the reconstituted Conference would be to consider plans for the formation of a permanent organization [...] on an international basis with the objective of promoting co-operation in educational matters in the post-war period” (Valderrama 1995, 41). In 1944, the draft of a charter for a new intergovernmental organization was published and the United Nations was founded in 1945. In London, November 1945, the United Nations held a conference in order to establish “a United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization” (Valderrama 1995, 42). Present here were the representatives of 44 countries that wanted this new organization to be an embodiment of a culture of peace and, in this manner,
establish an “intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind”.

As a result of this conference, 37 countries founded the United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The S of Science was added as a reaction to the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in order to clarify the importance of the importance of science to the wellbeing of mankind. The constitution of UNESCO that was signed on November 16, 1945 came into force on November 4, 1946 and a first draft of the functions of the Organization was made (Appendix 1) (Valderrama 1995, 44). The twenty countries that ratified this constitution were: Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Greece, India, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. From of this moment onward, UNESCO was a big organization with a budget of $6,950,000 which aimed for all its projects to be in line with its main objective; “to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture”. This phrase is based on the deeper philosophy of peace that UNESCO has and still has; the idea of “a peace which is something more than the mere absence of declared hostilities, a peace involving solidarity, concord and a concerted effort by free men to achieve security and happiness, the aim being to make war impossible by instituting truly human relations among all people of the world and to vanquish its causes through the social, material and moral progress of mankind” (Valderrama 1995, 51).

Since UNESCO could not repair the material destructed by the war, the only thing it could do was to “foster in all minds an awareness of the urgency of reconstruction of the devastated world, and the idea of keeping peace through mutual understanding” (Valderrama 1995, 51). In this line of thought UNESCO eventually became concerned with the protection of endangered heritage sites all around the world and with this it “contributed to peace and security by promoting collaboration among nations”. It became engaged in the creation of an international convention for cultural heritage, while in 1948 the concern for natural world heritage sites led to the establishment of the International Union for the Protection of Nature (IUPN) (van der Aa 2005, 2; UNESCO 2008, 9). The IUPN was later converted into the IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, now called the World Conservation Union) and became responsible for the creation of a global treaty for natural sites (van der Aa 2005, 2; UNESCO 2008, 9). In 1931 the Athens Charter was organized by the League of Nations and on the bases of this Charter and the 1964 Venice Charter (formally called the International Charter on the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites), which was seen as “an internationally accepted conservation philosophy”, ICOMOS was founded in 1965. These two charters played an important role in the development of concepts and ideas about the conservation and restoration of buildings and monuments and thereby the creation of laws and policies regarding the treatment of heritage (Pickard 2001, 7; UNESCO 2008, 9). With the signing of the convention, “each country pledges to conserve [...] the world heritage sites situated on its territory”. Besides the obligation to protect its own national heritage sites, a ratified country has the obligation to help preserve the listed sites outside its own borders. The counties therefore also have the right to call for international assistance for the preserving of its own heritage sites (van der Aa 2005, 87).

In 1972 the Member States of UNESCO adopted the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (the World Heritage Convention) in order to ensure the proper identification, protection, conservation and presentation of the world’s heritage “for the benefit of future generations of humankind” (Rakic & Chambers 2008, 3). This convention foresaw the establishment of the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Fund, which have been
in operation since 1976 (UNESCO 2008, 2). The first sites were inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1978; sites in Canada, the United States of America, Senegal, Poland, Germany, Ethiopia and Ecuador. In the years after the founding of UNESCO, many countries joined and sometimes signed off and on again because of political conflicts and during times of war. As of June 2010, 187 countries have ratified the World Heritage Convention, by which they have become a State Party to the Convention. This means the countries agree to “identify and nominate properties on their national territory to be considered for inscription on the World Heritage List [...]. States Parties are also expected to protect the World Heritage values of the properties inscribed and are encouraged to report periodically on their condition”.

The slogan of UNESCO, “building peace in the minds of men and women” is derived from the sentence that was stated above the Constitution of the Organization (once written down by a British statesman and an American poet, Clement Atlee and Archibald MacLeish): “Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed”. This sentence is very much a reflection of the circumstances in which the United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization was founded, but the organization still uses this sentence as its philosophical guideline (van der Aa 2005, 2). This philosophy has thus remained unchanged since its foundation and is also the foundation of the UNESCO-conservation philosophy: There is a common heritage that is of equal value to all mankind and so “the preservation of this common heritage concerns us all” (van der Aa 2005, 2). However, as (amongst many others!) Turnbridge and Ashworth state: “all heritage is someone’s heritage and therefore logically not someone else’s” (Turnbridge & Ashworth 1996, 21). This would imply there is no such thing as “world heritage”, though one could state that world heritage can exist in the form of international support for national heritage sites (van der Aa 2005, 3). Still there is an inevitability in over- and underrepresentation of certain (sub)cultures, as already mentioned in chapter one: “Where heritage is involved, collective amnesia is common. What is remembered, as tradition or heritage, is selected from a vast range of built, natural and cultural environments, to celebrate the past and bolster the present. Shameful episodes are rarely given prominence” (Harrison & Hitchcock 2005, 6).

3.1.1 The selection process

The most essential and at the same time the most difficult part of the listing-business is the selection process. One of the main criteria UNESCO holds in order for a site to be listed is that it has to be of “outstanding universal value”, which they define as: “cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity. As such, the permanent protection of this heritage is of the highest importance to the international community as a whole” (Appendix 2)(UNESCO 2008, 14). This is very much in line with their philosophy that there actually are sites and monuments that are of importance to all mankind, however, this is also a quality that is very hard to prove and can be interpreted in an awful lot of ways. In the 1970’s sites needed to be both outstanding and universal in order to get listed. These sites were often already popular amongst the bigger part of the world population prior to their nomination and were often deemed to be “global icons”. This gradually shifted towards a movement in which sites were nominated on their either outstanding or universal values by the 21st century. This switch was strengthened by alterations from within the World Heritage Committee, which will be elucidated later on. And since every site could be argued as unique in one way or another, this led to a culture in which sites were nominated in the hope that they would gain international fame because of their prestigious listing status (van der Aa 2005, 128-
Even though, in the words of Harrison (2005), UNESCO tends to be seen as the ruling body, the cultural equivalent of FIFA in association football, the World Heritage Committee only nominated a few sites as world heritage (Harrison & Hitchcock 2005, 8). Almost all heritage sites have been nominated on a national level, by the country in which the sites is located (van der Aa 2005, 22). In this way it is a country’s government that decides how the history of its country and its people are presented in its cultural heritage (Hall 1994, 188). How UNESCO defines cultural and natural heritage is written in article 1 and 2 of the World Heritage Convention (Appendix 3).

A nomination of a site can only be considered if this particular site had been put on the tentative list. The tentative list is basically a list of properties a country considers to nominate in the following five to ten years (van der Aa 2005, 19). After the World Heritage Centre has checked if the nominated site is present on the country’s tentative list, it continues the nomination process by checking whether or not the information accompanying the nomination is complete. Following this, an expert of IUCN or ICOMOS will assess the quality of the site after which he or she will write a recommendation (van der Aa 2005, 19). With ICOMOS’ policy to choose experts who “originate from the region concerned, but not from the country concerned”, they aim at the avoidance of conflicts of interest (ICOMOS 2010, 25). On the bases of this report, the World Heritage Committee will make the final decision about whether or not to include the site in the World Heritage List. This Committee exists out of 21 States Parties which are elected for a period of six years and of which every two year seven members will be replaced (van der Aa 2005, 152). In this decision, the Committee usually follows IUCN’s/ICOMOS’ advice (van der Aa 2005, 21). As mentioned before, the criterion of outstanding universal value is the number one criterion in order for a site to get listed. The way in which the measurability of this criterion is a contested factor in the selection process, is also already mentioned.

3.1.2 Developments in the selection procedure

Since 1977, with the establishment of the selection criteria in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention, there have only been minor alterations in the selection criteria, particularly concerning the formulation. The criteria of natural and cultural properties, which were previously two separated sets (criteria i-vi for cultural heritage and i-iv for natural heritage), became merged as a result of the 6th Extraordinary Session of the World Heritage Committee. Further changes in the cultural criteria consisted of short additional words or sentences and/or the elimination of words or sentences (Appendix 4). In these alterations, one of the main reasons for the under-representation of African cultural heritage is to be seen, since up till 1997 living cultures were excluded from the list. Because of UNESCO’s aim to create a “Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List” the Committee has adopted four Strategic Objectives at its 2002 session in Budapest (UNESCO 2008, 15). One of these objectives is to unset the imbalance that has been existing up to this day, which is the fact that Europe and Judaeo-Christian monuments have always dominated the list (Harrison & Hitchcock 2005, 8). To fill up the gaps that are created by this imbalance, UNESCO now encourages more countries to become States Parties and develop a Tentative List (UNESCO 2008, 15). Besides that the Committee has “contributed towards broader interpretations of the selection criteria” by valuing the representiveness of cultures and regions over
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5 According to article 1 of the 1970 Convention and article 2 of Chapter 1 of the 1995 Convention, cultural property is considered as: the possessions which, on religious or secular grounds, is of importance for archaeology, prehistory, history, literature, art or science and which belongs to one of the categories specifically listed in the Conventions.
the criterion of outstanding and universal characteristics (van der Aa 2005, 129). By a resolution adopted by the 12th General Assembly of the States Parties in 1999 in order to create a more balanced list, the underrepresented countries are encouraged to join and/or nominate more sites, while the well represented Parties are being asked to “consider whether their heritage is already well represented on the List and if so to slow down on their rate of submission of further nominations” (UNESCO 2008, 16). Harrison (2005) emphasizes here the contradiction of wanting a balanced list that represents sites of universal significance. Besides that, he argues that UNESCO employees could persuade countries with little representation of their heritage on the World Heritage List to nominate more or others sites “at considerable benefit to their careers” (Harrison & Hitchcock 2005, 8).

In the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2004, the annual limit on the number of nominations the Committee will review was set on 45 (including the nominations deferred and referred by previous sessions) and in the 29th and 31st sessions decisions were made about the order of priorities which will be applied in case the overall annual limit of 45 is exceeded. This decision is an example of the “broader selection criteria” mentioned before; when the annual limit is reached, nominations of States Parties with no listed properties are being given priority, followed by States Parties having up to three properties inscribed on the list (UNESCO 2008, 17).

Another influential change has been the shift towards the inclusion of modern architectural ensembles, which can be clearly seen by the increasingly younger sites inscribed on the list. This however might very well be a reaction to external changes, since there was an international appearance of heritage organizations like DOCOMOMO (the International Working Party for Documentation and Conservation of Buildings, Sites and Neighborhoods), which promotes 21st century architecture and TICCIH (The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage). While in 1978, the average age of all the cultural sites listed was 800 AD, in 2004 this average was raised to about 1200 AD (van der Aa 2005, 33-34). Also on the national level, there has been a shift of interest in the protection and qualification of monument status of a particular sort of heritage; the first legislation was often for pre-historical monuments, which shifted towards an interest in the Classical Mediterranean in the first half of the 19th century. This was followed by a movement inspired by the European Romantic Movement towards an interest in medieval and gothic architecture in the middle and late 19th century and in the 20th century this interest was expanded towards monuments out of the post-renaissance, Baroque, Palladian and Victorian periods. A growing attention for pre-1914, interwar and post-war heritage, primarily consisting of architecture and art, occurred at the end of the 20th century (Ashworth and Howard 1999, 47).

Because of these external tendencies and the changes in UNESCO’s global strategy (occurring since 1999, when the Committee adopted the “Global Strategy Action Plan”), the main purpose of the World Heritage List –to save the world’s “best” heritage sites– has changed over time. As Turtinen (2000) explains: “all states and ‘cultures’ have a right to equal opportunities of being part of the world heritage. Part of the story is that world heritage increasingly is seen as a resource, not for humankind, but for states, regions, local settings and business enterprises” (Turtinen 2000 in: Van der Aa 2005, 132). Today, this makes the World Heritage List more than anything an ideal means to represent a country and its national identity and serve the purposes of the tourism industry and nation building (Rakic & Chambers 2008, 3). With the adoption of the Convention of 1972, the ideological idea of World Heritage that was born just after World War I coincided with the discovery of marketing the marketing potential of heritage, which led to the increasing realization of the economical potential of heritage and the listing-status of UNESCO (Rakic & Chambers 2008, 3). This potential was soon discovered by countries which are highly dependent on income from tourism, like
the countries surrounding the Mediterranean sea and also more and more the countries in Eastern Europe. From these countries a “stream of local world heritage requests [...] can continue unrelentingly, even though these already much-represented countries have been asked to reduce the number of new nominations” (van der Aa 2005, 133). Off course, with this discovery, an imbalance on the list had become inevitable. From this point of view the decision to “broaden the selection criteria” in order to unset this balance can easily be understood. However, this decision can not resolve the intrinsic tension the very concept of “universal value” holds; by insisting on a balanced list with heritage sites equally spread over the world, the impossibility of the list actually representing the World Heritage seems farfetched and makes one return to the questioning of the very existence of World Heritage (Rakic & Chambers 2008, 4).

3.2 The Greek list (Appendix 5)
Greece was one of the twenty countries that ratified the Convention that founded the United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in November 16, 1945. In 1981 Greece ratified the World Heritage Convention and the first Greek site was listed in 1986. This was the temple of Apollo Epicurus in Bassae. Greece was mandate in the Committee in the periods 1985-1991 and 1997-2003. In 2011, Greece has 17 listed sites and with this, Greece is one of the top twenty countries with most inscribed properties (Appendix 6); it is on the 13th place, with amongst others Italy, Spain, France, China, the Russian Federation and the United States of America placed above it. Of the listed sites, 15 are cultural and two are mixed. One of these mixed sites, Meteora, is listed because of its cultural values since the evaluation of IUCN states: “the natural values on their own are not of universal significance and the site is best evaluated on its cultural attributes” (IUCN 455 1988, 55). Of the total 936 sites that are on the World Heritage List, there are 183 natural sites (20%) and 28 mixed sites (3%). The Greek percentage of mixed sites (12%) lies above the global percentage and since Greece has no natural sites the percentage of cultural sites is way higher than average (88 % compared to 77% of the total amount). However, when only the European and North American regions are taken into account, the Greek percentage of cultural sites more closely resembles the average ratio. In this region the percentage of mixed sites is 2%, natural sites 13% and cultural sites 85%. In comparison to the other Balkan countries (Appendix 7), Greece by far has the most listed sites; Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia and Montenegro are all represented by two sites on the list, FYROM only has one listed site, Serbia has four and the better represented countries are Croatia, Bulgaria and Turkey (respectively represented by 7, 7 and 9 sites). Just like Greece, these countries are mostly represented by cultural sites.

Greece’s Tentative List is last revised in January 2003 (Appendix 8). This list consists of eight properties of which one (Gorge of Samaria National Park) has been re-nominated after its rejection in 1989. Out of the eight sites, four are cultural, two mixed and two natural.
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6 Including Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, FYROM, Montenegro, Croatia, Serbia, Romania, Slovenia and Turkey
### The listed sites

#### 1986

**The Temple of Apollo Epicurius at Bassae**

*Criteria I, II, III*

**Period: Classical**

The Temple dedicated to Apollo Epicurius was built in the 5th century BC (c. 420-410 BC). It combines Archaic and Doric styles, uses Ionic and Corinthian orders and contains the oldest Corinthian capital found up till today. It provides perfect examples of the Archaic building style; it has an elongated surface, the ideal Archaic proportion in columns (15x6) and a north-south orientation.

The temple was discovered in 1765 and the first archaeological investigation was conducted in 1812. In 1814, King George IV of England acquired and transferred 22 sculpted Ionic friezes and the Corinthian capital from the temple to the British Museum. With this the temple lost its most exceptional decorations; the Centauromachy and Amazonomachy. In 1902 and 1965 restoration and renovation works have been performed on the temple. Despite this, according to the State Party, the temple still fulfills the integrity-demands, because it is “one of the best preserved temples of the Antiquity in the world” because of its long distance from settlements and the fact that after its construction no conversion or intervention has taken place –except for the previously mentioned reconstruction works (UNESCO 2006, 1).

ICOMOS considers this first nomination of the Greek State Party to be “a universally recognized cultural property” (ICOMOS 1985, 1). According to ICOMOS, the temple exhibits an important interchange of human values, because it contains the oldest Corinthian capital found yet and with this, the temple may be considered as a model for all “Corinthian” monuments of Greek, Roman and subsequent civilizations (ICOMOS 1985, 2). The site also represents a masterpiece of human creative genius, because –according to ICOMOS– it is “a unique artistic statement, remarkable for its archaic features [...] and for its daring innovations”. Besides that, the temple is a perfect example of a Hellenic votive sanctuary which represents the cultural tradition of Classical Greek society (ICOMOS 1985, 2). Because of the isolated mountainous setting the temple is located in, ICOMOS did recommend to make the entire area a protective one and that there can not be any tourist facilities built within view of the temple (ICOMOS 1985, 3).

#### 1987

**Acropolis, Athens**

*Criteria I, II, III, IV, VI*

**Period: Classical**

The site of the Acropolis contains the Parthenon, the Propylaea, the Erechtheion and the Temple of Athena Nike, and with this it holds four of the greatest masterpieces of Classical art. The buildings on the Acropolis were constructed from 447 to 406 BC. The Parthenon, the main temple dedicated to Athena, was built by Phidias, Ictinos and Callicrates from 447-432 BC. The Propylaea, which was the entrance built by Mnecicles from 437-432 BC, was later replaced the Gate of Pisistrasus. The temple of Athena Nike was built from 448-407 BC by Mnecicles and Callicrates and the Erechteion was completed in 406 BC. The buildings of the Acropolis –especially the Parthenon and the Propylaea– have inspired many neoclassical monuments throughout the world.

In 267 AD the first damage was done to the Acropolis; the temples were turned into churches by the Byzantines and they transferred the art treasures to Constantinople. In 1204, when the
The Byzantine Empire fell, Athens came under Frankish control. In this period from 1225 to 1308, the Propylaea had been turned into a castle and the Latin archbishop held services in the Parthenon. In 1456, the Turks took over. They converted Athens into a mosque and the Turkish governor used the Erechteion as his harem every now and then. In 1687, the Venetian armies of Morosini sieged the Acropolis and this resulted in an explosion, because the Turks had been using the Parthenon as a storage facility for gunpowder. In the 19th century, the marble sections of the Parthenon were taken by Lord Elgin, who transported the marble to the British Museum in 1815, in an attempt to link Britain to Greece spiritually (Hamilakis 2007, 254-255). Today the Acropolis is threatened most by air-pollution and the effects of mass tourism (van der Aa 2005, 108).

The site was already recommended by the Committee for the founding of a world heritage trust in 1965, which is illustrated by the statement made by ICOMOS: “The ideal World Heritage List, as dreamt by the writers of the Convention in 1972, reserved a very special place for the Athenian Acropolis from the very beginning” (ICOMOS 1986a, 1). Furthermore, the Parthenon has of course been the inspiration for UNESCO’s logo which underlines its significance as a world heritage property (van der Aa 2005, 16). The monuments of the Acropolis had, and still have, an exceptional influence, which can be seen in the Greco-Roman antiquity up till the modern architecture all over the world (ICOMOS 1986a, 3). With this, it exhibits an important interchange of human values through time by its architecture. According to ICOMOS, the Acropolis represents a masterpiece of human creative genius, because of the way in which the architecture and composition of the Acropolis “creates a monumental landscape of unique beauty consisting of a complete series of masterpieces of the 5th century BC”. Besides that, the buildings of the Acropolis bear “a unique testimony to the religions of Ancient Greece” (ICOMOS 1986a, 3). The Acropolis is tangibly associated with the civilizations of Greece through its buildings. Therefore these buildings illustrate significant stages in human history for a period of more than a thousand years, and the ideas with which the Acropolis is associated that live on till this very day, make this site a “memory of a precious part of the cultural heritage of mankind” (ICOMOS 1986a, 3). With the Acropolis being both the symbol of the World Heritage idea and the key symbol of Greekness it reflects the tension between national and universal heritage that exists in Greek heritage and the World Heritage concept itself (Rakic & Chambers 2008, 5).

Archaeological site of Delphi

Criteria I, II, III, IV, VI

Period: Prehistoric & Classical

Delphi was the site of the Omphalos, “the navel of the world”, in which the oracle of Apollo spoke. Therefore it was the religious centre of the world in the 6th century BC. It is located on Mount Parnassus, where a series of monuments were built from 490-485 BC. The main structures at the site are the Temple of Apollo, built in the 4th century BC over the remains of a 6th century temple; the Treasury of the Athenians, a building in Doric order erected in the 6th century BC; the Altar of the Chians, erected in the 5th century BC and the Stoa of the Athenians, built in the Ionic order after 478 BC. In the Theatre and the Stadium (built in the 4th and 5th century BC) the Pythian Games were held every four years. Other structures at the site are the Castelian Spring, which are two monumental fountains dating to the Archaic and Roman period; the Tholos, a circular building built in 380 BC in Doric order and the Polygonal Wall which was built in 548 BC after the destruction of the old Temple of Apollo.

Delphi has been a religious centre since the 8th century BC, when the cult of Apollo was established. In the 3rd century BC the Aetolians took over control of the settlement and in 191 BC it...
was conquered by the Romans. In the imperial times, the structures of Delphi played an important role, which left its marks on the buildings (primarily the Stadium and the Theatre). In these times, the sanctuary was plundered many times and ultimately, with the spread of Christianity, the religious meaning of Delphi got lost and the sites were closed down by Theodosius the Great.

The site of Delphi is a highly jubilated one in the opinion of ICOMOS, which is reflected in their statements: “Delphi is one of the foremost sites the drafters of the World Heritage Convention must have been thinking of [...]”, “one of the enduring missions of Delphi is to bring together men and women who otherwise remain divided by material interests” and “If the renown of Delphi outshines every other grand Hellenic sanctuary, there is a good reason” (ICOMOS 1986b, 1). ICOMOS compares the site of Delphi with that of Machu Picchu, because of its similar layout, in which the buildings in combination with the natural environment create a magical sphere. With this, according to ICOMOS, Delphi can be seen as a unique achievement which represents a masterpiece of human genius (ICOMOS 1986b, 2). Delphi had an impact throughout the world with the occurrence of its name in many events in the Ancient history, like (amongst many others) the gifts send by the kings of Lydia to the Sanctuary in the 6th century BC and the building of a statue in the honor of Hadrian in 125 AD. The site bears unique testimony to the religion of Ancient Greece, because it marked the introduction of the old heritage of myths originating from primitive times. Besides that, four sacred wars were fought over the Delphic oracle (ICOMOS 1986b, 2-3). Delphi is fashioned within a beautiful natural layout and it provides a great example of a Panhellenic sanctuary. Because the temple is located in a place where the ancients believed the Omphalos was located, Delphi is (according to ICOMOS) “directly and tangibly associated with a belief of manifest universal significance” (ICOMOS 1986b, 3). Even though this site thus primarily holds Classical remains, it seems to be listed primarily because of its “mythological qualities”.

Medieval city of Rhodes

Criteria II, IV, V

Period: Frankish

The medieval city of Rhodes contains one of the most exuberant ensembles of the Gothic period in its Upper Town, while in its Lower Town this Gothic architecture exists alongside monuments from the Ottoman period. Hereby, it illustrates the period of the Crusades and its function as a stronghold—which is still clearly visible—represents its almost impregnable image during the Middle Ages. The most impressive Frankish monuments of Rhodes are the Palace of the Grand Masters (15th century); the Great Hospital (1440-1489), which replaced the original hospice and is currently used as an archaeological museum; the Street of the Knights and the tower of Naillac, which was built from 1395-1412 under the Grand Master Philibert de Naillac.

From 1309 to 1523 Rhodes was occupied by the Knightly Order of St. John of Jerusalem. This occupation transformed Rhodes into a stronghold which withstood sieges like those attempted by the Sultan of Egypt in 1444 and Mehmet II in 1480. The city fell in 1522 by Suleyman II and subsequently came under Turkish and, much later, Italian rule. Rhodes is divided according to Western Classical style: It has a high town to the north and a lower town in the south-southwest. This high town, the Collachium, was entirely built by the Knights Hospitalers who became the strongest military order in all Christendom. After 1523 most of the churches (of which some were Byzantine) were converted into Islamic mosques. The addition of Islamic structures continued up to 1912. These included mosques, baths and houses. The Italian occupation (1912-1948) left a considerable mark on
Rhodes with its heavy Mussolini-period architecture and with many pastiches and restorations carried out in contradiction to the Venice Charter. This caused a debate about the need for further reconstruction and the rebuilding of monuments like the completely destroyed tower of Naillac, which collapsed in 1863.

ICOMOS expressed its concern for the rebuilding activities and the restoration policy that was adopted in Rhodes in the 20th century, for it remained to be seen “whether extreme restoration policies based on a firmly established tradition will continue to be carried out under the pretext of integrated preservation or touristic development” (ICOMOS 1987a, 3). The Bureau stated that whether desirable or not, the monuments of the Italian period are also part of the history of Rhodes and even the wiped out history (like the tower of Naillac) would better be done justice if they would stay vanished. Therefore ICOMOS recommended inscription under the condition that all conservation work would be carried out under the control of the Greek Ministry of Culture and according to the rules laid out in the Venice Charter and the Toledo International Charter for the conservation of historic towns and urban areas (ICOMOS 1987a, 3; UNESCO 1988, 4). According to ICOMOS, Rhodes exhibits an important interchange of human values by the technological and architectural influence of its “impregnable” Frankish fortifications throughout the eastern Mediterranean basin at the end of the Middle Ages (ICOMOS 1987a, 2). Rhodes represents the period in human history in which a military/hospital order remained in existence after its founding during the crusades and with this it reflects a context characterized by an obsessive fear of siege. Besides that, ICOMOS states that Rhodes exhibits a successive chain of cultures and traditions characterized by “complex phenomena of acculturation” (ICOMOS 1987a, 2-3). In spite of these justifications, the “main reason” as stated by ICOMOS, is a rather vague one and formulated in a less evincive matter: “recalling that in 1980 the modern capital of the order of St. John of Jerusalem, which was established in 1530 at La Valetta, was inscribed on the World Heritage List, is a fortiori favorable to the inclusion of the city of Rhodes [...]” (ICOMOS 1987a, 2).

**Meteora**

**Criteria I, II, IV, V, VII**

**Period: Byzantine & Post-Byzantine**

The Meteora are monasteries on rock columns which consist of sandstone and conglomerate and were shaped by fluvial erosion and seismic activity. Since Meteora means “suspended in the air”, this is exactly what the structures of Meteora seem to do. This place marks a significant place of retreat and prayer and illustrates a stage in history when the eremitic ideals of Christianity were restored. The 16th century frescoes of Meteora had a widespread influence in the development of post-Byzantine painting.

Monks settled in this area from the 11th century onwards and built their first church at the foot of one of the columns in the late 12th century. Because of political instability in the 14th century Thessaly, they started building monasteries on top of the peaks. At the end of the 15th century there were 24 monasteries. They flourished until the 17th century. At this time there are only four monasteries that still house religious communities.

The frescoes made by Theophanes the Cretan in 1527 had a lasting and widespread influence and mark a key stage in the development of post-Byzantine painting. With this, according to ICOMOS, they exhibit an important interchange in human values through time (ICOMOS 1987b, 2). Because of the combination of the buildings and their surreal placement upon the rock pillars, The Meteora are a unique artistic achievement and because of their vulnerability they symbolize “the
fragility of a traditional way of life that is threatened with extinction” (ICOMOS 1987b, 1-2). The Meteora provide “an outstanding example of the types of monastic construction”, which marks the point at which hermetic ideals were restored in both the western world and the Orthodox Church (ICOMOS 1987b, 2). The Meteora is listed as a mixed property, because the monasteries are situated in an exceptionally beautiful environment and therefore, the Meteora provide an outstanding example of the use of natural features as the foundation of an impressive structure. However, IUCN strongly recommended this site to be evaluated based on its cultural features and states that it should not be added on the basis of its natural values, for these are not of universal significance (IUCN 1988, 55).

Mount Athos

Criteria I, II, IV, V, VI, VII

Period: Byzantine & Post-Byzantine

Mount Athos, “the Holy Mountain” has been an autonomous spiritual centre since 1054. Today there are twenty monasteries, twelve skites and about 700 houses, cells or hermitages to be seen at the mountainous site which houses over a thousand monks. Mount Athos’ school of painting influenced the Orthodox art and its development of religious architecture had a great influence on the Orthodox world.

According to Greek mythology, the peninsula on which Mount Athos is located was the stone that the giant Athos had thrown at Poseidon and the Christians thought of it as the “Garden of the Virgin”. The exact date on which the first Christians settled here is unknown, but since 963 the monastic movement began to intensify. In 972 the first Typikon was signed at Karyes by the monks of Mount Athos and the emperor Jean Tzimiskes. In 1046 the Typikon granted by emperor Constantine IX Monomadchus was signed by over a hundred people of religious communities. This Typikon banned all the “smooth-faced persons”, thus meaning women, from the mountain and turned Mount Athos into a spiritual centre. The areas on Mount Athos are organized according to strict 10th century principles: a square/rectangular or trapezoidal wall flanked by towers in which the catholicon (the community’s church) is centered, and the areas for communal activities, for liturgical purposes and the defensive structures are strictly separated. Also characteristic for the medieval period is the organization of the agriculture in idiorrythmic skites (daughter houses of the main monasteries), kellia and kathismata (farms operated by monks).

ICOMOS deems Mount Athos to be of universal importance because it is seen as the spiritual home of the Orthodox Church and with this it has an everlasting influence on Orthodox Christianity: “For Christians it was the ‘Garden of the Virgin’, the priceless gift Christ gave his mother” (ICOMOS 1987c, 9). The monasteries of Athos provide the typical layout for orthodox monasteries according to strict 10th century principles and the organization of agricultural lands is very characteristic of the Medieval period, with which Mount Athos exhibits an important interchange of human values on developments in architecture and landscape design (ICOMOS 1987c, 10-11). The monastic ideal, as well as the vernacular architecture and agricultural craft traditions, which are preserved at the site of Mount Athos, represent the agrarian cultures of the Mediterranean world (ICOMOS 1987c, 11). The setting in which the monasteries are placed (like Meteora compared with those of Machu Picchu) provides a brilliant example of the transition of a mountain into a sacred place, which in combination with its many precious wall paintings, illuminated manuscripts and golden objects, makes Mount Athos represent multiple masterpieces of human genius (ICOMOS 1987c, 10-11). Like Meteora, Mount Athos is listed as a mixed property because of this interaction between nature and culture,
which is spectacularly demonstrated by the monks that live in hermits clinging to the cliff high above the sea in Karoulia.

Paleochristian and Byzantine Monuments of Thessalonika
Criteria I, II, IV
Period: Early Christian & Byzantine
Thessalonika was one of the first bases from which Christianity spread. The site contains many churches and important Christian art, like the mosaics of the Rotunda, St. Demetrius and St. David. The churches date from the 4th to the 15th century and with this they show a diachronic typological series which reflects the importance of the city to the Christian world through time.

The city was founded by Cassander in 315 BC, who named it after his wife Thessaloniκē. Thessalonika became one of the Roman capitals in Macedonia which grew into a wealthy seaport and because of this, it became of strategic importance during the Roman period. Thessalonika’s churches had a great influence on the development of the Byzantine, and later the Serbian, monumental arts throughout the Christian period, the high Middle Ages and the Palaeologan Renaissance. The mosaics of the Rotunda, St. Demetrius and St. David are amongst the best examples of early Christian art. As an important seaport and city of commercial and strategic importance, Thessalonika witnessed a multitude of cultural influences which is still visible in the great variety of the site’s monuments (however this has depleted over the years). Amongst the Byzantine churches are the Basilica of the Virgin (the “Acheiropoietos” after 448); St. David’s (late 5th or early 6th century) and St. Sophia (8th century). This last church is a combination of the Greek cross plan and a three-nave basilica plan and it became the Cathedral of Thessalonika in 1205, after the Latin conquest. In 1246 the city was returned to Byzantium and a new series of churches were built; the St. Panteleimon, the Holy Apostles, St. Nicholas Orphanos, and the present St. Catherine’s. In 1430, when the Ottomans took over the city, most of the churches were converted into mosques and other new sanctuaries were built, like the Hamza Bey Cami (1467-68) and the Alaca Imaret (1484). In the period of Ottoman control (1430-1912) Thessalonika was restored to the status it had in the early Christian era.

According to ICOMOS, Thessalonika represents a masterpiece of human creative genius, because of the fact that the mosaics of the Rotunda, St. Demetrius and St. David’s are amongst the masterpieces of Early Christian art (ICOMOS 1987d, 2). Furthermore the influence of the Thessalonian churches to the monumental arts in the Byzantine and Serbian world, and the great examples they pose for churches built from the 4th to the 15th century with a central, basilical and intermediary plan, makes them exhibit an important interchange of human values through time in church-architecture and provide an example of an architectural ensemble that illustrates these various stages in human history (ICOMOS 1987d, 2).

Sanctuary of Asclepios at Epidaurus
Criteria I, II, III, IV, VI
Period: Classical
The site of Epidaurus contains temples and hospital buildings devoted to healing gods, and therefore it provides a testimony to the healing cults of Greek and Roman times. Epidaurus is situated in a valley in the inland Argolid and it holds multiple ruins, primarily out of the 4th century BC. The most important buildings at the site are the Sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas, the Theatre and the Sanctuary of Asclepios and its accompanying buildings.

The sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas was developed during the 6th century and placed over the
remains of a sanctuary dating from the Mycenaean period. The Theatre is deemed a masterpiece, created by Polycletes the Young of Argos in the 4th century BC. It integrates perfectly in its natural setting and reaches near perfection in its proportions and acoustics. It has regained a function since it has been used as the scene of an annual festival that has been held there from 1955 onwards. The Sanctuary of Asclepios, the god of medicine, (4th century BC) and its accompanying buildings, had a great influence on all the asclepieia in the Hellenic and later Roman sanctuaries (of Esculape). The accompanying buildings to the sanctuary of Asclepios include baths, a gymnasium, palaistra, a katagogeion (dormitories for patients) and a stadium. Every four years, this stadium dating from the 5th century BC, hosted games. In the 4th century BC the temple of Apollo Maleatas and the Hieron were built. The Hieron includes multiple buildings; the temple of Asclepios, the temple of Artemis, the Tholos, the Enkoiemeterion (where the ill recovered), the baths of Asclepios, the Propylaea and the Theatre.

ICOMOS states that the Theatre can be seen as a masterpiece of human creative genius because of its perfect acoustics and proportions and its great integration into the site. An excellent example of a 4th century BC Hellenic architectural ensemble is provided by the Hieron (ICOMOS 1987e, 2). Also, the Sanctuary of Asclepios has greatly influenced the Asclepieia in the Hellenic and Roman world and therefore it exhibits an important interchange of human values throughout time on medical and architectural developments (ICOMOS 1987e, 2). The Committee added criterion II; “the influence of Tholos of Epidaurus on the development of architecture and ornamentation of Corinthian style in Greek and Roman art” (UNESCO 2006a, 2). The Sanctuary of Epidaurus bears exceptional testimony to the healing cults of the Hellenic and Roman worlds and the way in which the functional evolution of this sanctuary represents the emergence of modern medicine associates Epidaurus directly to living traditions (ICOMOS 1987e, 2).

1989
Archaeological Site of Mystras
Criteria II, III, IV 7
Period: Byzantine
The city of Mystras was built as an amphitheater around a fortress erected in 1249 by the prince of Achaia. From 1346 to 1460, Mystras was the capital of the Despotate of Morea and therefore it is also called the “wonder of the Morea”; because of the beauty of its churches, which were covered with frescoes during the Paleologus Renaissance, and the renown of the Mystras’ libraries and the glory of its writers.

In 1249 a Frankish lord, the prince of Achaia, built a castle on the 620 m high hill that overlooked Sparta. Around this castle the city of Mystras was built. As the capital of the Despotate of Morea, Mystras was a cosmopolitan city with beautiful churches and renowned libraries. Over time the city was recaptured by the Byzantines, then occupied by the Turks and after that occupied by the Venetians, briefly in 1669 and for a longer period from 1687-1715. The city was recaptured by the Ottoman Empire in 1715 and after it was burned by the Albanians during the Magna Revolt of 1770, it was left in a decaying state until it was definitively abandoned in 1832, when King Otto I founded the new city of Sparta.

This site was originally nominated in 1988, but was rejected because ICOMOS insisted on the protection of the surrounding landscape of the city outside the archaeological protection perimeter

7 There is no official justification provided on the inscription criteria by the State Party in the original nomination document of Rhodes, they did provide a justification on the outstanding value of the site
and because of the lack of “carefully planned measures of maintenance” (ICOMOS 1988a, 3). Furthermore, ICOMOS had problems with the plans of the “Committee to Restore the Monuments of Mystras” that wanted to rebuild the palace of Mystras. This would be (similarly to the reconstruction of the Stoa of Attalus in Athens) a modification to the “intrinsic equilibrium between the landscape, the existing monuments and the ruins” (ICOMOS 1988a, 3). In 1989, after Greece had sent UNESCO the required information, ICOMOS decided unanimously not to recommend the inclusion of Mystras on the World Heritage List, because of the restoration plans that still existed for the site. ICOMOS’ belief that reconstruction to that degree would “seriously modify the aesthetic and historic features of a site whose authenticity is specifically linked to its state as a ruin” (ICOMOS 1988a, 2). In November 1989 ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee met to examine the document. ICOMOS’ conclusion remained that they could not recommend Mystras to be included on the World Heritage List as long as the project approved by the Central Archaeological Council was still on the agenda. When the Greek authorities finally assured them they would “not take any action which might compromise the integrity and authenticity of the site”, the Committee decided to include Mystras on the World Heritage List at the end of 1989 (UNESCO 2006b, 2).

Archeological Site of Olympia
Criteria I, II, III, IV, VI
Period: Classical

The site of Olympia became a centre for the worship of Zeus in the 10th century BC. The Altis holds one of the highest concentrations of masterpieces from ancient Greece. The most important buildings of the site are the temple of Hera, the temple of Zeus— which housed the Statue of Olympian Zeus, one of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World—, and the Nike by Paeonios. Besides these temples, the remains of the Olympic Games can be seen at the site. These games were held at Olympia since 776 BC and the Olympiad, which is the four year period in between the games, became a chronological measurement and system of dating used in the Greek world.

Olympia has been inhabited since Prehistoric times and remains from the Mycenaean and middle Helladic period can still be seen. In the area there was a succession of religious centers of worship during the Hellenistic period. The monuments that are visible at Olympia are the temple of Hera (6th century BC), which housed the Hermes of Praxiteles and the temple of Zeus (470-457 BC), which was a model to the great Doric temples built in Southern Italy and Sicily in the 5th century BC. This temple housed large votive Archaic bronzes and sculptures, including the Olympian Zeus, which was created by Pheidias between 438-430 BC. Other monuments include the row of Archaic Treasuries from the 6th and 5th centuries BC and the Nike by Paeonios (420 BC), of which the influence can still be seen in iconographic allegories of Victory in neoclassical art of the 19th century. Later additions to the complex are the Metron and the Echo Colonnade (4th century BC), the Philippeion (338 BC) and the Exedra of Herodes Atticus (157-60 AD).

The importance of the Olympic Games is still visible in modern society and, according to ICOMOS, the Olympics symbolize the ideals of Hellenic humanism; “a peaceful and loyal competition between free and equal men, who are prepared to surpass their physical strength in a supreme effort, with their only ambition being the symbolic reward of an olive wreath” (ICOMOS 1988b, 13). With this, Olympia is directly and tangibly associated with an event of universal significance. In the opinion of ICOMOS, the site’s qualities are obvious: “The renown and universal value of Olympia are so evident that it would seem superfluous to justify them” (ICOMOS 1988b, 12). The sanctuary of Altis holds many masterpieces of human creative genius. This is also true for (amongst others) the Hermes
of Praxiteles found in the Temple of Hera (ICOMOS 1988b, 12). The influence of the monuments of Olympia, visible in the Roman art up to the neoclassic art, can be deemed a standard in architecture and with this, they exhibit an important interchange of human values over time on developments in arts. Olympia bears an exceptional testimony to the ancient civilizations of Peloponnesus and also provides a great example of a Pan-Hellenic sanctuary with a religious, political and social function (ICOMOS 1988b, 12-13). Furthermore, ICOMOS stresses how the revival of the Olympic Games in 1896 illustrates the “lasting nature of the ideal of peace, justice and progress, which is no doubt the most precious but also the most fragile feature of the world’s heritage” (ICOMOS 1988b, 13).

1990
Delos
Criteria II, III, IV, VI
Period: Prehistoric & Classical
The island of Delos contains the Sanctuary of Apollo, which attracted pilgrims from all over Greece. Nowadays, it is an exceptionally extensive and rich archaeological site that reflects the greatness of Delos as a Mediterranean port in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC. The island also hosted the Delian Festivals, one of the main events in the Greek world.

Delos was amongst the first important Greek sites that captured the attention of archaeologists, which caused many reproductions of its monuments in travelers’ sketchbooks. Mythology says Apollo was born on this small island in the Cyclades. Delos has traces of civilizations from the 3rd millennium BC to the Paleo-Christian era. Until 316 BC the Delian Festival was organized on Delos, which was a festival that had existed from very early times according to the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, composed in 522 BC. This Delian Festival was a celebration that took place every four years in May. It included gymnastics, equestrian, and musical competitions, dances, theatrical productions and banquets. In 69 BC the island was sacked by Athenodoros and with this event the great era of maritime trade ended. The island was abandoned in the 6th century AD and after this successively captured by the Byzantines (727 AD), the Slavs (769 AD), the Saracens (821 AD), the Venetians, the Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem and the Ottoman Turks.

The preference for certain sites to be included on the World Heritage List is reflected by the first statement ICOMOS makes in the justification of Delos: “Like Delphi and the Acropolis in Athens, Epidaurus and Olympus, Delos is a site crucial to the credibility of the World Heritage List” (ICOMOS 1989a, 19). Throughout the Greco-Roman period, Delos’ buildings and monuments had a considerable influence on the development of architecture and monumental arts (ICOMOS 1989a, 20-21). Delos bears unique testimony to the civilizations from the 3rd millennium BC to the Paleo-Christian era and it also bears exceptional testimony to cultural tradition as the host of the Delian Festival, which was an important event much like the Olympic and Pythic Games (ICOMOS 1989a, 21). Besides that, Delos provides an outstanding example of an architectural ensemble which illustrates the survival of an important Mediterranean port throughout difficult periods (independence in 316 BC, the second exile of the Delians in 166 BC and the fall of Corinth in 146 BC). Finally, Delos is directly associated with one of the main myths of Hellenic civilization, the birth of Apollo (ICOMOS 1989a, 21). In light of the beautiful surroundings of the site, ICOMOS recommended the Greek authorities to control their tourist flow and to protect the entire island and not just Delos. Furthermore they recommended protecting also the sites of Rheneia, Lesser Rheumatiari and Greater Rheumatiari, because of their close connection to Delos’ past (ICOMOS 1989a, 22).
Monasteries of Daphni, Hosios Loukas and Nea Moni of Chios

Criteria I, IV

Period: Byzantine

Daphni, Hosios Loukas and Nea Moni of Chios are not in close proximity to each other; Daphni is near Athens, Hosios Loukas near Delphi and Nea Moni is on an island near Asia Minor. However, these places have typological similar monasteries, which share the same aesthetic characteristics. All three monasteries have a cross-in-square plan –which is deemed one of the most perfect creations in Byzantine architecture– and a large octagonal dome. In the 11th and 12th centuries AD they were decorated with marble works and mosaics on a gold background, which were characteristic features of the “second golden age of byzantine art”. This is why the Greek State Party chose to nominate these cities as a collection of masterpieces of Byzantine art, instead of nominating all sites individually (which is not uncommon; especially typologically similar buildings –like the Wooden Churches of Slovakia–, places connected with each other by natural phenomena –like the Prehistoric pile dwellings around the Alps– and sites that were connected with each other through crusades and pilgrim routes are known to be listed in a group).

The monastery of Daphni replaced a temple dedicated to Apollo Daphneios, which was destroyed in 396 AD. The first monastery was built in the 5th century AD and abandoned again in the 7th and 8th centuries, because of the Slav invasions. In 1100 Daphni was finally restored and the church was built under Byzantine rule. In this period many other monastic buildings were built and the church was decorated with elaborate mosaics. In 1205 the monastery was sacked by Frankish crusaders and in 1207 the Duke of Athens gave it to the Cistercians of the Abbey of Bellevaux. After Athens was taken by the Ottoman sultan Mehmet II in 1458, Daphni was returned to Orthodox monks. The monastery was deconsecrated in 1821 and has been undergoing restoration work since 1888. The monastery of Hosios Loukas was built over the remains of a church for pilgrims built in the 10th century AD. This big 11th century church housed many iconographic treasures and was decorated with many mosaics, frescoes and marble slabs. The construction of the monastery in Nea Moni is completely documented, because it was linked to a major historical Byzantine event concerning Constantine the Gladiator, who founded the monastery in 1045. The design of this monastery is simpler and it has a more oriental art then the other two monasteries.

According to ICOMOS, the monasteries represent masterpieces of human creative genius because of the exceptional quality and beauty of their mosaics and paintings. ICOMOS highlights the fact that these paintings and mosaics are outstanding enough to individually qualify all three monasteries to be masterpieces of Byzantine art. Because of these unique artistic achievements the monasteries are great examples of a characteristic building construction of the middle period of Byzantine religious architecture (ICOMOS 1989b, 27).

Pythagoreion and Heraion of Samos

Criteria II, III

Period: Prehistoric & Classical

Samos was the leading maritime and mercantile power of the Greek world in the 6th century BC, which is reflected by the remains of the Pythagoreion (the ancient city) which contains a fortified port with Greek and Roman monuments and a spectacular tunnel which runs over 1040 m through the mountainside (the Eupalinaio). Another important structure is the temple of Samian Hera, the Heraion, which is still visible on the site.
The earliest finds on Samos belong to the 4th or 3rd millennium BC, but Samos has been inhabited since the 16th century BC, with its colonization by the Minoans who were later supplanted by the Mycenaens. By the 6th century BC, Samos had gained a great nautical power in the eastern Mediterranean, because of its close proximity to and trade links with Asia Minor. Because of the defeat by the Persians, this political influence weakened at the end of the 6th century BC. However, Samos kept its importance as a trading city throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Samos continuously altered between Byzantine, Turkish and Venetian rule in the following centuries, until in 1910 it was finally fully united with Greece. The city consists of the Pythagoreion, with the ancient fortified port and the Eupalineio, which was the work of Eupalinos of Megara in the 6th century BC. The fortifications of the Pythagoreion were built in the Classical period and have Hellenistic additions. The great temple of Hera was built over the remains of older temples. The 8th century BC temple was the first Greek temple that was surrounded by a peristyle of columns. The 7th century temple that succeeded this one was also unique, because of its double row of columns to the front. In 570 BC the last temple was built, which was the earliest temple in the new Ionic order with at least a hundred columns. This temple was destroyed in a Persian raid and the temple that had to replace it was never finished. Surrounding the temple, altars, smaller temples, stoas, statue bases and the remains of a Christian basilica dating to the 5th century AD can be seen.

The Heraion of Samos exhibits an important interchange of human values over time, because of the fundamentality and the influence of the temple in the Classical architecture; it has influenced the architecture of temples and buildings throughout the Greek world and served as a model for the engineering of public works (ICOMOS 1991, 3). The mainly untouched archaeological remains bear exceptional witness to the importance of Samos to the maritime and mercantile Greek world in the 6th century BC. A mentionable fact about this nomination is that it has been strongly supported by leading Greek scholars in France and the United Kingdom who agreed that Samos is “one of the most important sites of Greek Classical history” (ICOMOS 1991, 3).

Archaeological Site of Aigai (Vergina)
Criteria I, III
Period: Classical

Aigai was the first capital of the Kingdom of Macedonia. Aigai’s most important features are the monumental palace and the burial ground, which contains not only over 300 tumuli, but also the Great Tumulus; the royal tomb of Philip II.

The region of Vergina was already settled in the Early Bronze Age (3rd millennium BC) and the Cemetery of the Tumuli reflects the importance of Aigai in the Early Iron Age (1100-700BC). This cemetery is situated in the center of the necropolis. This necropolis extends for over 3 km and the oldest tumuli dates from the 11th century BC. During the Archaic period and the century that followed, Aigai was the most important urban centre in the region, which is reflected by the lavishly decorated monumental palace. This palace had a religious, political and administrative function and was two or three stores high. It had Doric colonnades, a gallery on the north side and it was richly decorated with mosaic floors and painted stuccoes. The theatre was an integral part of the palace complex and dates from the mid-4th century. To the northwest of the city a group of tombs from the 6th/5th century BC is situated, which belonged to members of the Macedonian dynasty and their courts. Amongst these is the Great Tumulus of Philip II, which is an artificial mound of 13 m high and with a diameter of 110 m. In this tumulus four royal tombs were found. The body of Philip II was laid
in a golden casket of circa 11 kg and the tomb contains a frieze of which is believed that it is the work of Philoxenos of Eretria. Another structure related to the Royal family is the Sanctuary of Eukleia. This sanctuary contains small temples dating out of the 4th to 3rd century BC, which contain statue bases inscribed with the names of members of the Macedonian royal family. When Aigai lost its administrative function to Pella in the 4th century BC, it remained the sacred city of the Macedonian Kingdom. In 336 BC, Alexander married Cleopatra in Aigai and he was proclaimed king because of the assassination of Philip II in the theatre. The struggles between the Diadochoi in the 3rd century and the overthrow of the Macedonian Kingdom by the Romans in 168 BC damaged the city heavily. The city was rebuilt, but the population increased between the 2nd and the 5th century AD. Only a small settlement remained of which the name, Palatitsia (Palace), was all that was left that reminded of the former importance of the city.

ICOMOS recommended listing Aigai on the bases of criterion III, because the series of royal tombs bear a unique testimony to the transition from Classical city-state to the Hellenistic and Roman imperial structures. With this the Aigai shows “a significant development in European civilization” (ICOMOS 1995, 39). The Committee decided to add criterion I to the site, because the paintings that adorn the Macedonian tombs represent a masterpiece of human creative genius by their “extraordinarily high quality and historical importance” (UNESCO 1996, 67). Noteworthy about this inscription is that one of the main reasons to qualify Vergina for inscription (in the original justification of the State Party) is the presence of the royal tomb of Philip II (ICOMOS 1995, 36). However, ICOMOS decided not to list Vergina on the bases of this particular feature, for “There has been some controversy about the identification of Tomb II in the Great Tumulus as that of Philip II of Macedon” (ICOMOS 1995, 38). The State Party decided to ignore this very politically-correct statement of ICOMOS, by mentioning on the UNESCO website that “the Great Tumulus is identified as that of Philip II, who conquered all the Greek cities, paving the way for his son Alexander and the expansion of the Hellenistic world”.

1999

Archaeological sites of Mycenae & Tiryns

Criteria I, II, III, IV, VI

Period: Mycenaean

Mycenae and Tiryns were important cities in the Mycenaean civilization. They appear in the Homeric epics, the Iliad and the Odyssey and with that they have influenced European art and literature for over three millennia. The most important features of Mycenae are Grave Circle B, Grave Circle A and the Palace. Tiryns’ most eminent structures are the Cyclopean walls and the Palace.

The earliest occupation in Mycenae occurred during the Neolithic period (c. 4000 BC). The oldest remains from the sites date from the mid-Hellenic period. Of these remains, the most important features are Grave Circle B (17th century BC) and Grave Circle A (16th century BC). The site was abandoned when it was conquered by Argos in 498 BC. At this time the construction of an Archaic temple had begun at the leveled top of the hill. Mycenae was re-occupied for a short time in the Hellenistic period. In this period another temple was built and a theatre was constructed over the Tomb of Clytemnestra. Tiryns earliest occupation was, just like Mycenae, in the Neolithic period and its oldest architectural remains, which were found in the Upper Citadel, date from the Early Bronze Age (c. 3000 BC). In the Middle Bronze Age (circa 1900-1600 BC), this area was leveled in order to accommodate for new buildings. Tiryns had the same faith as Mycenae and it was finally abandoned in the 5th century BC.
Mycenae and Tiryns are a combined nomination, similar to the monasteries of Daphni, Hossios Luckas and Nea Moni, because the State Party (and the Committee) deems them to be the two most characteristic examples of Mycenaean citadels “which have similarities and differences, and constitute a continuous entity since they complement one another” (ICOMOS 1998b, 1). Like with the individual sites of the monasteries, ICOMOS emphasizes that Mycenae and Tiryns are adequate to be listed individually, since they both represent masterpieces of human creative genius. The architecture and design of the Lion Gate, the Treasury of Atreus, the underground reservoir and Grave Circle A at Mycenae represent masterpieces of human creative genius and in Tiryns especially the Cyclopean walls and the palace complex are good examples of the importance of the site in Prehistoric Greek civilization (ICOMOS 1998a, 50). The appearance of Mycenae and Tiryns in the Homeric epics and the administrative palace system, which operated for five centuries, are evidence for the influence the Mycenaean civilization has exercised in the creation of the following civilizations, visible in their architecture and urban design. However, according to the State Party, the cities also represent the homogeneity of the civilization in which the idea of “a common ethnic consciousness reached its apogee” (ICOMOS 1998a, 50). ICOMOS adapted this vision of continuity by deeming Mycenae and Tiryns to be “the two greatest cities of the Mycenaean civilization which dominated the eastern and Mediterranean world in the 15th to 12th centuries BC and which played a vital role in the development of the culture of classical Greece” (ICOMOS 1998a, 54).

Historic Centre (Chorá) with the Monastery of Saint John

Criteria III, IV, VI

Period: Byzantine

Chorá on the island Pátmos, situated in the Dodecanese, is said to be the place where St. John the Theologian wrote his Gospel and the Apocalypse. Since the establishment of the late 10th century monastery, which was dedicated to him, Chorá has been a place of pilgrimage and Greek Orthodox learning. The most important features on Pátmos are the Monastery of Hagios Ioannis Theologos (St. John the Theologian) and the Cave of the Apocalypse.

Chorá is one of the three settlements on the small island Pátmos. The other two settlements; the 19th century Harbor of Skála and the small rural Kampos are way smaller, which results in Chorá dominating the entire island. When Pátmos was integrated in the Roman Empire, it served, like many other islands, as a place of exile for political prisoners. Amongst these prisoners was St. John, who came to the island in 95 AD, during Domitian’s reign. Pátmos was amongst the many Aegean islands that were devastated in the 7th century BC by Saracen raiders. For almost two centuries the island remained nearly uninhabited. The building of the monastery dedicated to St. John began in 1088 and in 1208, when Pátmos was captured by the Venetians, Chorá was founded. In the 16th century the island came under Turkish control and with this a period of prosperity started. The island became an important shipping and trade-center, which is clearly visible in the architecture of the fine houses built in the late 16th and early 17th century, some of which have survived. When the island was sacked by the Venetians in 1659, the prosperity ended. After a slow recovery of its mercantile status, Pátmos became a major trading centre again in the late 18th and throughout the 19th century. One of the most unique features of Chorá is that it is one of the few settlements in Greece in which the religious ceremonies that date back to the early Christian times have remained unchanged (however it must be mentioned that there are a few other places in the world where practices also remained unchanged).

ICOMOS finds the Monastery of Hagios Ioannis Theologos and the Cave of the Apocalypse to
be great examples of a centre of traditional Greek Orthodox pilgrimage and commemorations of two of the most sacred Christian works, since it was at these places that St. John the Theologian wrote his Gospel and Apocalypse. This makes Chorá directly associated with the work of St. John the Theologian (ICOMOS 1998c, 60-61). ICOMOS recommended Chorá to be listed on the basis of criteria IV and VI, but the Delegate of Thailand doubted the eligibility of criterion VI and proposed criterion III to be applied instead. The Committee and ICOMOS agreed with criterion III, because of the already mentioned uninterrupted evolution that Chorá has had in the practicing of its religious ceremonies. However, delegates and observers decided to keep criterion VI, because of the high values of the site (UNESCO 1999, 14).

2007
Old Town of Corfu
Criteria IV
Period: Venetian

Corfu is known for its fortifications, which were built and designed by renowned Venetian engineers. The three forts of the town were in use for four centuries in order to defend the maritime trading of the Republic of Venice against the Ottomans. The traces primarily visible in the present town are from works of the 19th and 20th centuries, which gives Rhodes the look of a neoclassical town.

Corfu has been under Venetian rule from the 11th to the 15th century, after that sub sequentially the French, British and Greek seized control of the island. During this entire period Corfu had to defend the Venetian maritime empire against the Ottoman army. Because so many governments had been in control of Corfu, it displays a variety of cultural influences. The fortifications, which have been rebuilt and repaired multiple times, the Old Citadel and the New Fort show traces of the Venetian period, but are dominated by traces of the British interventions. The Old Town is primarily adorned with a neoclassical building stock and in the houses of the later period (19th century) the trend of the Venetian period to build multiple-storey buildings is noticeable. While the Old Town was severely damaged by bombing in 1943, which caused the destruction of houses, public buildings, churches and a few buildings in the Old Citadel, the new town continues to grow under the pressure of expanding tourism.

Corfu was nominated with the proposed inscription criteria I, II and IV. According to the State Party, Corfu would meet criterion I because of the forts; being the “work of the leading architects and engineers, the fortifications required all the creative genius of those involved to be united in an organized effort in which science and art triumphed over nature” (ICOMOS 2007, 168). ICOMOS did not agree with applying this criterion to Corfu; they stated that “even though it is an illustration of the military architecture of the late renaissance period in a remarkable position [...] it would go too far to say that criterion I is fully illustrated by the site” (ICOMOS 2007, 168). Considering criterion II, the State Party stated that Corfu would exhibit an important interchange of human values, because “it is unique in preserving traces since the 8th century of Corinthian, Macedonian, Roman, Byzantine, Angevin, Venetian, French, British and Greek influence. Corfu has never known racial, political or religious hatred” (ICOMOS 2007, 168). To this, ICOMOS responded that there are not enough grounds to support this criterion, since the main proponents of Corfu are the results of modern influences (the fortifications and the old town), and the reference to the other periods are similar to most Mediterranean places (ICOMOS 2007, 168). This left Corfu listed on the bases of only criterion IV, because it provides an outstanding example of the structure and form of Corfu’s medieval and Renaissance features. With this the State Party explicitly meant the multi-storey neoclassical
buildings of the Old Town. ICOMOS, however, disagreed with these buildings being sufficient to meet this criterion. After analyses it was decided that Corfu can meet criterion IV because its fortifications represent a significant aspect of the Venetian period in the eastern Mediterranean. Because of that the fortifications constitute “an architectural example of outstanding universal value in both its authenticity and its integrity” (ICOMOS 2007, 168). This last sentence is an ambiguous one, for the bombing of 1943 caused considerable damage, thus decreasing the city’s integrity. The authenticity of Corfu is severely challenged by the fact that it has witnessed major alterations over the course of its existence, due to various armed conflicts, alterations and rebuilding activities (ICOMOS 2007, 172).

3.2.2 The rejected sites

1987
Gorge of Samaria National Park
Criteria VII, VIII, IX, X (natural)
The Gorge of Samaria National Park is in fact called the White Mountains National Park, but is generally named after its most interesting gorge; the Gorge of Samaria, which stretches over 16 km. The park was established in 1962, when the land was bought from the inhabitants of the village of Samaria and they were evacuated. It covers 4850 ha and houses many endemic species and plant associations in its rich and diverse biotopes.

The decision document of 1987 only holds a small paragraph in which is stated that the Bureau recommended “to defer a final decision on this nomination since the State Party concerned offered more information on the value of this property, and to arrange for a more detailed site inspection by IUCN” (UNESCO 1987, 5). Incomplete documentation thus seems to be the reason for this rejection. However, there might also have been other grounds for the rejection of the Gorge of Samaria National Park. In 2003 the site reappeared on the tentative list.

1988 Lesbos, petrified forest (natural)⁸
The petrified forest of Lesbos is a dense area of fossilized remains of plants and trees, which is designated as a protected natural monument. There are only two (known) petrified forests in the world and although the Petrified Forest National Park of Arizona is better known, the forest of Lesbos is larger. It is presumable to think that this site might have been rejected on grounds of incomplete documentation. However, this is by no means a certainty.

1989 Santorin, Akrotiri archaeological site (Prehistoric)
Akrotiri is a Bronze Age settlement on the island of Santorini, which is associated with the Minoan civilization because of the findings; inscriptions in Linear A and fresco’s which bear close resemblance to Minoan fresco’s. Why this site was rejected in 1989 is unclear. Perhaps there was no sufficient protection of the site—which is often a ground for rejecting a site—, considering the fact that a protective roof structure has been build, which had to blend in with the surrounding environment by carrying a layer of earth. This construction however collapsed just before its completion in 2005, which caused the life of a visitor⁸. The site was closed down for visitors and has remained this way ever since.

---

⁸ Of Lesbos and Santorin no documentation (nomination or decision documents) is available
3.2.3 The tentative list of 2003

The Palace of Knossos

Criteria II, III

Period: Minoan

The Palace of Knossos was the most important political, economical and religious centre of Crete in Minoan times. The State Party states it is “a masterpiece of Minoan architecture and [the palace] constitutes a monument of outstanding universal value”. Around 1700 BC the New Palace was built over the remains of the Old Palace, which was built around 1900 BC and destroyed in 1700 BC. Both the old and the new palace were multi-storey buildings with a central court. The new palace covered an area of 22000 square meters, and with that it was the largest Minoan Palace in Crete. It existed out of four wings, which contained hundreds of rooms; a central and a west court. Each wing had its own function: the north wing contained the Teloneion of “Customs house”; the east wing included the grand staircase with the royal residence quarters; the south wing was the main entrance to the palace and the west wing housed the shrines and storages. The New Palace gradually lost its great political power around the early 15th century BC.

British archaeologist Arthur Evans performed heavy restoration works on large parts of the palace from 1900 onwards. Due to this Knossos lost a great deal of its integrity. However the State Party leaves this unmentioned in its Tentative List, this might be a reason for ICOMOS not to recommend the listing of this site.

Archaeological Site of Nikopolis

Criteria I, II, III, IV, VI

Period: Roman

Nikopolis is seen as the city that reflects the Romanizing of Greece, because of its founding following the victory of Augustus in the battle of Actium in 31 BC. In memory of this battle, Augustus’ monument was founded by Octavian in the north of the city. In the first three centuries of the Roman Empire, Nikopolis was the capital of Epirus and Acarnania. Nikopolis is a true colony, which is visible in the gritted street plan including the decumanus and the cardo, the city walls with the four city gates. Important buildings of Nikopolis are buildings from the Roman era, including an Odeum (1st century AD and in use to the second half of the 3rd century AD), a theatre, a gymnasium and a stadium and buildings from the Byzantine era; the Christian/Byzantine Walls and seven basilicas.

Nikopolis was granted substantial political and economical privileges by Augustus and it is because of him the city became decorated with beautiful monuments and the Actium Games were revived. When Nikopolis was the capital of Epirus and Acarnania during the first three centuries of the Roman Empire, it was a centre of Greek culture and a location where the eastern and western world collided. In this era the Odeum, theatre, gymnasium and stadium were built. Also, a 50 km long aqueduct carried water from the Louros springs to the Nymphaeum. This Nymphaeum was situated on the western side of the fortification walls and from there the water was distributed in the city. From the mid 5th century AD, it became a Christian tinted administrative, religious, artistic and spiritual centre. Even though the size of the city was reduced by 1/6th, because of the Christian character Nikopolis flourished in the early Christian period with an economic and spiritual boom, which is demonstrated by the fortification program instigated by Justinian (called the

---

9 From the tentative lists only little documentation from the website of UNESCO is available. This makes the justification of the criteria by the States Parties unavailable for usage in this assessment
Christian/Byzantine Walls) and the monuments built in this period. The seven basilicas also bear witness of this flourishing period for Nikopolis: The Basilica Alpha (525-575 AD) is decorated with beautiful mosaics; the Basilica Beta (built around 500 AD) also was decorated with mosaics; the Basilica Gamma and Basilica SigmaTau are built around 575-600 AD and the Ayrmatos Basilica and the Basilica of the Holy Apostles were situated outside the Byzantine walls. In the 9th century the city’s importance declined by the reorganization in the Byzantine Empire and the replacement from the capital, from Nikopolis to Nafpaktos. In the 13th century the city was completely abandoned.

Archaeological Site of Philippi
Criteria II, III, IV, VI
Period: Roman & Byzantine

Philippi was an important economic power in the 4th century BC and later in the Roman and Early-Christian period. It gained wealth by exploiting its resources and because of the Via Egnatia that ran through the city. The most eminent features of the city are the Roman forum, the theatre and the many sanctuaries carved out of rocks in the Roman Era. From the Byzantine Era the church of St. Paul (or Basilica of Paul) and the Octagon are the most prominent features of Philippi.

In 365 BC, Philip II of Macedonia occupied the site Dikili Tash, which dated from the Neolithic period. He renamed it Philippi, fortified it and established Macedonian settlers. Out of this early period very little evidence remained; only the theatre (mid-4th century BC) and a little Heroon (later taken up in the courtyard of Basilica A) represent this period. The wealth Philippi gained by the Via Egnatia running through the city is clearly visible in the Roman forum, which was built between the reigns of Claudius and Antoninus Pius, and consisted of various public buildings organized around a central square. In order to house Roman games, the 4th century theatre was enlarged. In the Roman Era, many sanctuaries were carved out of rocks: the Sanctuary of Artemis, the Sanctuary of Silvanus, the Three-Conch Sanctuary, the Sanctuary of Cybele and the Sanctuary of the Egyptian Gods. The Battle of Philippi (42 BC), in which Octavian and Mark Anthony fought the republicans Cassius and Brutus, marked the end of Roman democracy by the defeat of Cassius and Brutus (which was described in William Shakespeare’s “Julius Ceasar”). In 49/50 AD, the Apostle Paul, who founded the first Christian church in Europe, came to Philippi. A small church dedicated to St. Paul, “the Basilica of Paul”, was raised in 312-343 AD. Philippi turned from a Roman colony into a Christian centre in the second half of the 4th century, but its original ancient Greek character was recovered in this period. This is reflected in the acropolis, which was in use in the mid- and late-Byzantine periods. The Octagon that also dates from this period (400 AD), consists of a baptistery and additional buildings in which is said the tomb of St. Paul was worshipped. The city’s decline began at the end of the 6th century and during the Byzantine period Philippi turned into a small stronghold. At the end of the 14th century the city was captured by the Turks and all that is left now is a touristic area of ruins.

Lavrio (Ancient Laurion)
Criteria II, III, V
Period: Classical

Lavrio has always been a centre of interest and activity because of its mineral wealth. Especially in the Classical Period (5th and 4th centuries BC) the mines of Lavrio played a particularly important role. Lavrio’s resources were necessary in the financing of the projects of the Golden Age, the building of the fleet used in the Persian Wars and the minting of the silver Athenian coin, the Laurion “owl”. With this Lavrio had an important part in the strengthening of the foundations of the Athenian state.
Around 3200 BC the first systematic exploitation of this area started and Lavrio’s minerals were distributed amongst the Aegean’s grandest cultures; the Cycladic, Minoan and Mycenaean. The important role of the mines in the Golden Age is widely represented in the finds throughout the region, which exist out of mining galleries, mineshafts, (parts of) metal and metallurgical workshops, ore washeries etcetera. The mining activity declined during the 3rd century AD and with that the importance of Lavrio decreased. However, modern Lavrio was revived with the reopening of the mining galleries in 1860. Two major companies controlled these mines; The Greek Metal Works Company of Lavrio (1873-1917) and the Compagnie Francaise des Mines du Laurium (1875-1982), which caused the town to expand and grow into a “company town”, including schools, churches and a Athens-Lavrio railway. After World War II the mining industry faded away, which caused the closing down of the mines in the 1970’s and in 1990 the metallurgical industry ceased to function entirely.

The broader region of Mount Olympus

Criteria mixed
Period: Classical

Mount Olympus is the mythological birthplace of the twelve Olympian Gods, the muses and the Graces. The spread of this myth throughout the Greek-speaking world was done by the writings of Homer in the Iliad and the Odyssey and of Hesiod in the Theogony. With this the elements of the first Greek religion were established. One of the most important archaeological sites is Dion (inhabited from the Classical to Early Christian period and a Macedonian city from the 4th century BC on), which contains a fortified wall, an organized street plan and places of worship (outside the wall). Remains from the Roman period consists of (amongst others) baths and other public buildings, an odeion, shops, workshops, a theatre, sanctuaries, a stadium and a cemetery are found and from the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine periods a couple of monuments with characteristic and painted decoration are still to be seen. Other archaeological sites in the region of Mount Olympus are Azoros, Meleas, Kastri in Livadi, Elassona, Dolichi, Pythio, Tempi and Gonnoi. These findings at these sites primarily represent the Byzantine, Post-Byzantine and Early-Christian periods.

The region of Mount Olympus has been significant since the Prehistoric period. In the region of Agos Dimitrios and Petra there are cemeteries that represent the inhabitation in these Prehistoric times. From the tribes of this region, the Pierians and the Perraibians, the myth was extracted that the Mount Olympus was the home of the twelve gods, the Muses and the Graces. Homer’s writings spread this myth by stating that Mount Olympus was the home of the ancient gods and the centre of Greece. The highest peak belonged to Zeus and his daughters and the Muses/Olympiades lived in the ravines. In the later Roman and Byzantine periods, the spiritual centre moved elsewhere and Olympus lost some of its importance. Due to its location it was still regularly attacked by Goths, Bulgars, Vlachs, crusaders and Serbs, who travelled to Thessaly and southern Greece. In a period of upheaval in the 14th century a big part of the population, especially of Pieria, was forced to move. In the history of Pieria, and of Macedonia in general, Mount Olympus played a important role because of its geographical position, and it was used as a place of refuge during upheavals and conflicts.

The site is nominated as “mixed” because the region of Mount Olympus is a characteristic natural region, which houses a number of threatened species, important geological formations and a variety of protected flora and fauna. The flora is one of the richest in Europe and the Olympus National Park holds the highest mountain forest in Europe, on the highest mountain in Greece.\textsuperscript{A}
The area of the Prespes Lakes: Megali and Mikri Prespa which includes Byzantine and post-Byzantine monuments

Criteria mixed

Period: Byzantine

The area of Prespes is a large basin with two lakes that cover FYROM, Albania and Greece and has been inhabited since antiquity. With the growth of Orthodoxy, the natural beauty of the area became increasingly associated with myths and legends. Many Byzantine and Post-Byzantine monuments can be seen at this region, like churches, rock-paintings with Christian themes, and the hermitages of monastic communities.

In the Byzantine Era, in the 8th century AD, and in the periods of Bulgarian intervention, the Prespes Lakes area flourished. Later in the 10th and 11th centuries another prosperous period started with the founding of the archbishopric of Achrida by Basil II. In 1386 AD it was occupied by the Turks and during the Ottoman reign, Orthodoxy and religious tradition rose, which caused the area to become increasingly associated with myths and legends. Another interaction between man and nature is can be seen in the work of the monastic community that turned natural caves into hermitages between the 13th and the 18th century. Mikri Prespa covers Albania and Greece. On the island of Agious Achilleos there are many Byzantine and Post-Byzantine monuments to be found; Vidronisi contains the ruins of a church dating back to the time of the Paleologos Emperors; the village of Pyli and the village of Plati, which houses the Church of Agios Nikolaos (Pyli’s church is a false three-conch church out of the 13th century and Plati’s church is a single-aisled church with significant wall-paintings dating to 1591 AD). Megali Prespa covers FYROM, Albania and Greece and in this area also many Byzantine and Post-Byzantine monuments are to be found, amongst others in the villages of Lemos, Agios Germanos and Psrades, of which the latter holds rock paintings of the Virgin Blachernitissa (1455-56 AD), the Virgin Eleousa (1373 BC) and of Agios Nikolaos (1827 BC). On the southwest shores, the hermitages of the monastic community can be seen.

Just like the site of Mount Olympus, the Area of the Prespes Lakes is nominated under the category “mixed” because of the special natural environment the primarily Byzantine and Post-Byzantine monuments are situated in. This area covers a 4,900 ha core and a surrounding zone of 14,750 ha. This makes it the largest National Park in Greece with the highest biodiversity levels. The animal species in the park include some of the rarest in Europe and besides the Danube Delta and the former USSR it is the only place in Europe where more than two species of pelican reproduce.

National Park of Dadia – Lefkimi – Souflion

Criteria VII, X (natural)

The National Park of Dadia is one of the most natural and traditionally managed ecosystems in Greece. It has a unique value for the conservation of birds and in particular birds of prey. The national park covers an area of 43,000 Ha and consists of a forest and a traditional urban and agricultural landscape. It houses 36 of the 38 species of diurnal raptors that occur in Europe and one of the two Aegypius monachus (black vulture) breeding colonies of the European continent. This site has a designated Special Protection Area for the protection of birds and the potential for two Sites of Community Importance for the conservation of natural habitats.
### Evaluation: Developments in the Greek World Heritage List

**Table 1 - The Greek World Heritage sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Year of inscription</th>
<th>Selection criteria</th>
<th>Main period of use</th>
<th>Site category</th>
<th>Type of site</th>
<th>Other information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bassae</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>I, II, III</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acropolis</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>I, II, III, IV, VI</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Group of buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>I, II, III, IV, VI</td>
<td>Prehistoric &amp; Classical</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>Importance of Myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>II, IV, V</td>
<td>Frankish</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteora</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>I, II, IV, V, VII</td>
<td>Byzantine &amp; Post-Byzantine</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Monasteries</td>
<td>Orthodox centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Athos</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>I, II, IV, V, VI, VII</td>
<td>Byzantine &amp; Post-Byzantine</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Entire region of the monasteries</td>
<td>Orthodox centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessalonika</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>I, II, IV</td>
<td>Early Christian &amp; Byzantine</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Churches &amp; monuments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidaurus</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>I, II, III, IV, VI</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystras</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>II, III, IV</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>I, II, III, IV, VI</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>II, III, IV, VI</td>
<td>Prehistoric &amp; Classical</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Importance of myth Pilgrimage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphni, Hosios Luckas &amp; Nea Moni of Chios</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>I, IV</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Monasteries</td>
<td>Group nomination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>II, III</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Old city &amp; monuments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergina</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>I, III</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae &amp; Tiryns</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>I, II, III, IV, VI</td>
<td>Mycenaean</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Archaeological sites</td>
<td>Group nomination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorá</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>III, IV, VI</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Historic city-centre &amp; monastery</td>
<td>Pilgrimage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfu</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Venetian</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Old city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the development of the list there are a couple of irregularities to be seen that could indicate tendencies, although this is hard to prove because of the little amount of data available. What is noticeable are the three Byzantine/Post-Byzantine sites listed in 1988. The other three of the in total six Byzantine sites were listed in 1989, 1990 and 1999. Another thing that stands out in the list is that there has been a Classical site listed every listing year, with the exception of the last two years (1999 and 2007). In 1999 Mycenae and Tiryns were listed as one entity and with that they are the only set that represents the Mycenaean period. Delphi and Delos also partially represent the Prehistoric period, however the material remains of these sites are primarily Classical. What makes these sites representatives of the Prehistoric period is primarily due to their association with ancient myths. The Frankish and Venetian periods are present on the list, but they are severely underrepresented in comparison to the Classical and Byzantine periods; the only Frankish site is listed in 1988 (Rhodes).
and the only Venetian site in 2007 (Corfu). Noteworthy is the absence of any sites whatsoever representing the Ottoman and Roman periods.

When taking into account the rejected sites, the only thing that can be said is that two out of the three sites were natural sites. This is interesting, because the Greek List exists solely out of cultural sites and two mixed sites, of which one is listed because of its cultural values. This of course points to the importance Greece ascribes to its cultural heritage, but it can also indicate the importance other countries ascribe to the cultural heritage of Greece. This external interest could be a reason for Greece to nominate primarily cultural sites, but it could also be the reason for the rejection of natural sites by either IUCN or the Committee; for Greece is of primarily cultural value and there are other—not so culturally-rich—countries of which natural sites can be listed. This of course all depends on the reason for rejection, which might very well be simply a lack of documentation provided by the State Party or something of the like.

**Table 2 - The Tentative List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Selection criteria</th>
<th>Main period of use</th>
<th>Site category</th>
<th>Type of site</th>
<th>Other information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knossos</td>
<td>II, III</td>
<td>Minoan</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Palace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikopolis</td>
<td>I, II, III, IV, VI</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>Reflects the Romanizing of Greece St. Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippi</td>
<td>II, III, IV, VI</td>
<td>Roman &amp; Byzantine</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>Phillip II St. Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavrio</td>
<td>II, III, V</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Historic city &amp; mines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Olympus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Region of Mount Olympus</td>
<td>Importance of myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prespes Lakes: Megali &amp; Mikri Prespa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Region of the Prespes Lakes &amp; its monuments</td>
<td>Importance of myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park of Dadia-Lefkimi-Souflion</td>
<td>VII, X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Tentative List on the other hand, a (small) tendency towards the incorporation of more natural heritage on the list can be detected. This Tentative List exists out of eight sites, four of which are cultural, two are mixed and two are natural. Of course, two natural sites on the Tentative List is still not overwhelming, but it is more than the current amount of natural sites listed. Another thing noticeable on the Tentative List, are the two sites that represent the Roman periods; Nikopolis and Phillipi (of which the latter also represents the Byzantine period). This is interesting because there are no sites on the current Greek World Heritage List that represent the Roman period. Just like on the Greek list, sites representing the Ottoman period are absent on the Tentative List.

Some of the tendencies and irregularities on the Greek list are in line with the general trend occurring on the World Heritage List; with the inclusion of Corfu in 2007, the Greek list seems to be participating in the current general trend towards the inclusion of more modern sites (Ashworth & Howard 1999, 47). However, this is only one site, and no matter how convincingly modern it may be,
it is hard to base conclusions on just this site, because in the greater scheme Greece still appears to hold on to primarily nominating sites that represent the Classical period. However, Corfu can be used as proof that Greece does seem to respond to UNESCO’s request of 1999 (aimed at the well represented State Parties, asking them to lower down their nominations of World Heritage sites), since this has been the only Greek site nominated since then.

**The selection criteria**

Greece is not the kind of country UNESCO is willing to apply the “broader selection criteria” to. The shift that can be detected in the Greek list towards justification based on less selection criteria in fact occurs prior to this new UNESCO policy that started in 1999. However, there does appear to be a tendency towards the incorporation of sites that meet less selection criteria in the Greek list; the first ten Greek sites were all listed based on the justification of three to six of the selection criteria, but since 1990 (starting with the inclusion of the Monasteries of Daphni, Hossios Luckas and Nea Moni of Chios) three of the seven sites listed met only two of the selection criteria and one (Corfu) meets only one criterion. In the analyses of these selection criteria, noticeable was that the sites representing the Classical period all meet criterion III: *Bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared*. Besides the sites that concern the Classical period, also many of the sites that represent the Byzantine period meet criterion III. However, besides Meteora, Mount Athos, the Monasteries and Thessalonika, also the two sites representing the Frankish and Venetian periods do not meet this criterion. Of course this can be a coincidence, however it also could be perceived as a form of patriotism; all sites that contain Classical and/or Prehistoric Greek heritage are unique and/or exceptional testimonies to the Greek civilization –which is, according to many justifications, still living in a Hellas kind of fashion–, while the sites that represent the Frankish or Venetian (and to some extent the Byzantine) periods are not exceptional testimonies to those civilizations. Since the Greek State Party can propose on the bases of which criteria a site can be justified for inscription, this could mean that the State Party does not think the Greek sites are able to bear an exceptional testimony to these civilizations, because it is not their own civilization the sites would bear testimony to (thus feeling it is not their position to decide what sites are able to bear this testimony). However, it could also indicated that the Greek State Party does want the sites to be listed, but not as unique to these civilizations, because they are Greek sites and so they can not bear exceptional testimony to other civilizations. Since the Byzantine period seems to be well-incorporated within the Greek national history, this could be an indicator for the duality of Greece, for maybe Greece feels that Europe expects the only cultural tradition or civilization Greek heritage can bear “exceptional testimony” to, is the Hellenic one. Of course, these decisions might also have been made with other motivations and the division between the Classical/Prehistoric and the other sites could have been created unconsciously.

**Greek contested heritage**

The ideology with which the World Heritage Convention was founded in 1972 can be easily understood as an attempt to unite countries and nations after a period of successive wars through the idea that there is heritage of equal importance to all, which holds within it a “universal identity” and which has to be conserved for the future of mankind. However, since nations can not be built without a common shared history –which is reflected in its heritage– heritage will always belong to the historical narrative and imagined community of a nation. And with this in mind, the claims for a site –which is exactly what is done when a property is listed on the World Heritage site; it is claimed by a country as its own– can easily increase international tensions instead of reducing them. This is
especially true for “contested sites”: Sites that bear within them the traces of multiple national histories. Many of the sites on the Greek World Heritage List belong to this category. Vergina is an obvious example of a contested site; located in Central Macedonia it is placed in the centre of the Macedonian Conflict and with the archaeological findings, including the tomb of Philip II, it became “the focus of conflicting claims and interpretation on an international scale” (Kotsakis 1998, 44). With the listing of this site Greece effectively claimed it to be part of its history. However Vergina is one of the most publicly debated subjects of this “claiming contest” many other Greek World Heritage sites are located in contested areas. In fact, eight out of the seventeen Greek sites are located on borderlands (Vergina, Thessalonika, Mount Athos, Delos, Chorá, Rhodes, Nea Moni of Chios and Samos)(see Figure 1). According to Pantzou (2009), these borderlands are of great national significance and she argues that “nationalism is often shaped in the periphery- in the borders”, since they “provide the limits of nations’ imagination” (Pantzou 2009, 15). Since this is especially true for the Balkans, with the many “selves and others”, these borderlands are important to the Greek nationalism and it might therefore be argued that Greece purposely nominates sites in contested regions in order to claim these pieces of “homeland”. This argument might be strengthened by the fact that six out of the eight properties on the Tentative List are also located on contested lands: Knossos and the Gorge of Samaria National Park are located on Crete, The National Park of Dadia lies along the Northeastern border and Philippi, Mount Olympus and the Prespes Lakes are located in Macedonia (the latter is even located partially in FYROM and Albania). Hitchcock (2005) therefore suggests that in order for UNESCO to gain back some of its original ideology, when sites like these are listed, this has to be done in a way that they promote “transnational rather than national spaces” and incorporate all the stakeholders in the narrative of the site, so that the sites on the World Heritage list become “more a scene of dialogue rather than conflict” (Hitchcock 2005, 184-185).
Chapter 4
Discussion

4.1 What narrative does the Greek World Heritage List tell?

On the Greek World Heritage List, the Classical and Byzantine periods are by far the best represented periods. There are eight sites in total that contain monuments from the Classical period and six of these sites represent only the Classical period. The other two sites represent the Classical and Prehistoric periods. However, this is mainly due to their association with myth: Delos is associated with the birth of Apollo and Delphi is (still) seen as “the navel of the world”. The tangible remains of these sites are primarily Classical, but considering the emphasis both the State Party and ICOMOS place on the mythological connotations of these sites, the remains of the Classical period do not seem to be the main reasons for the nomination and listing of these sites. The texts of the nomination and justification for inscription of the only site that contains remains of the Mycenaean period is very heavily adorned with claims that the Mycenaean civilization “laid the foundations for the evolution of later European cultures”, thus claiming the continuity of the Mycenaean civilization into the Classical civilization and beyond. This might be the main reason for nominating and listing these sites, for Greek prehistory seems often only to be deemed important when it can be related to the Greek world, whether it is indirectly through myths and legends (like what seems to be the case with Delos and Delphi) or “directly”, by creating a genealogical and/or cultural link between the Mycenaean and Classical civilizations (Kotsakis 1998, 54). Interestingly, the Byzantine period is almost equally well-represented as the Classical period: There are six sites that are listed because of their importance in the Byzantine period. Concerning these sites, often their importance as an Orthodox centre and their function as pilgrimage are highlighted (this is for instance illustrated by the nomination and justification texts of Meteora, Mount Athos and Chorá). Thessalonika was also of major importance to the Orthodox world, for this was one of the first bases from which Christianity spread. And even though Mystras contains primarily Frankish monuments, it was the “the wonder of Morea”, and thus it is inextricably linked to the Byzantine Empire.

Besides these two well represented periods (and the not-so-well represented Prehistoric period), there is one site that represents the Frankokratia (or Latinokratia); Rhodes is listed because of its importance during the Frankish period and its fortifications are praised for their “impregnability” in the withstanding of many (Ottoman) sieges. Corfu is listed because of its Venetian fortifications, which defended the Republic of Venice against the Ottomans. To point out the common denominator of these last two sites might be considered a politically incorrect thing to do. However, it is interesting that the only two sites that were not nominated because of their Classical (/Prehistoric) or Byzantine features, shared the same praised ability to withstand the Ottoman Empire. Following this, it might be superfluous to mention that not a single site on the Greek World Heritage List represents the Ottoman period. The same is true for the Roman period (though there are off course sites listed that contain Ottoman or Roman remains). With this, a clear refusal to incorporate Greece’s Ottoman and Roman history into the national narrative is reflected by the Greek list.

In miniature, the Tentative List resembles the Greek World Heritage List: It contains two sites that represent the Classical period, one site that represents the Prehistoric period (however in this case it concerns the Minoan civilization) and two of the sites represent the Byzantine period. In one of these two sites, Philippi, the Roman features are also emphasized and there is one site incorporated on the Tentative List that primarily represents the Roman period. This is interesting, for
there are currently no sites listed that are representative of the Roman period. Notable about the texts of these sites (written by the States Parties), is that they emphasize the importance of these sites in the periods previous to, and after the Roman colonization, thereby highlighting the Hellenic and early Christian periods. For example, in the case of Philippi, the occupation by Philip II of Macedonia, the presence of the Apostle Paul and the fact that it “recovered its original ancient Greek character” when it became a centre of Christian worship are emphasized. Also in the text of Nikopolis, it is mentioned that the church was –“according to tradition”– founded by the Apostle Paul and while during the Roman period Nikopolis was “the center of Greek culture and a meeting point between the eastern and western worlds”, afterwards it became “the administrative, artistic, spiritual and religious centre of the area with a Christian character”. This can be viewed as an attempt to incorporate Greece’s Roman history into the national history, not because it brings pride to the Greeks, but just to fill the gaps in the national narrative told by the World Heritage List (Liakos 2008, 206).

Just like what could be detected in the texts of the listed sites, also in two of the sites on the Tentative List—Mount Olympus and the Prespes Lakes— the importance of the sites’ connection to a myth is deemed to be of great importance. This is very logical in the case of Mount Olympus, which is off course linked to the Olympian Gods and the starting-point of the first Greek religion. However, myths do not leave tangible remains and so other elements of the region—which can be protected—are stressed. From this viewpoint one could argue that it might be better to list Olympia as a natural site, for there is nothing tangible to protect and only the mythological realm needs to be conserved. However, this is still not the purpose of the UNESCO World Heritage List, for even though the debate concerning intangible heritage has grown in the last couple years, this is not what the UNESCO World Heritage List was designed for. Also the region of the Prespes Lakes is deemed to be of mythological importance, for it became more and more associated with myths and legends during the growth of Orthodoxy and religious tradition. However, in comparison to Mount Olympus, this site is a mixed site and it also contains many monuments and buildings from the Byzantine era (thus the same period from which the myths and legends originate). This makes it easier to argue for the need of protection of this certain representation of that period.

4.2 A local or a global narrative?

The justification of the sites’ qualities by the Greek State Party is often very “travel-agency like”, in that it is very optimistic about the global significance of Greek heritage. In some cases the exaggerations tend to go beyond realism, like the claim that Mycenae and Tiryns were “the two greatest cities of the Mycenaean civilization, which dominated the eastern Mediterranean world from the 15th to the 12th century B.C” and that they “represent the apogee of the Mycenaean civilization, which laid the foundations for the evolution of later European cultures”. This is however an impossible claim, for the Mycenaean civilization seized to exist and its lands were eventually overtaken by the Dorian civilization. Even though not all the information provided in the documentation is accurate, it is not unusual or highly inappropriate for a country to advertise its own splendor (since the information on the website is provided by the State Party). Contrary to this, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee are supposed to be neutral and objective in examining these nominated sites and the accompanying documentation. There are however multiple directions leading to the conclusion that this is not always the case. According to Pantzou (2009) ICOMOS and the Committee often reject, alter or re-interpret the site’s ascribed significance, “perpetuating western conceptions of heritage’s value” (Pantzou 58, 2009). The fact that the Committee is not
always impartial can be seen in some of the statements they make in the assessment of the sites, for example the statement made about Mount Athos: “The absence of Mount Athos on the World Heritage List has been a periodic subject of concern for the Committee since 1978. ICOMOS is thoroughly pleased that the nomination concerning this landmark has been submitted” (ICOMOS 1987c, 10). By mentioning a site is felt to be absent on the list, the Committee implies a certain approval of the listing, which again applies that the assessment of the site perhaps could have been less critical then it would be for other, less praised sites. The justification of why Delphi should be listed according to ICOMOS also sounds a little impartial: “Delphi is one of the foremost sites the drafters of the World Heritage Convention must have been thinking of when on 16 November 1972 at the UNESCO General Conference, they draw up the ‘list of cultural properties of exceptional value whose handing down to future generations is a duty for all humanity,’ not merely for those countries who possess the heritage” (ICOMOS 1986b, 1).

For Greece, this lack of neutrality seems to be working out well; in the nomination of Butrint by Albania, ICOMOS and UNESCO stressed the Greek character of the site instead of the “Chaonian period and period of Romanization” proposed by the State Party. Pantzou (2009) sees this inconsistency between ICOMOS and UNESCO at the one hand and the State Party at the other hand as an attempt of the former two, to prevent the undermining of global values of a property by national values placed upon heritage”. However, these perceptions are not global, but primarily western and it also happened to be primarily Northern and Western Europeans and western-educated experts that examined the site of Butrint (Pantzou 116, 2009). When one combines this with the jubilation with which ICOMOS and the Committee seem to be willing to accept and stress the importance of Greek Classical sites –like demonstrated by the statement made in the justification for the listing of Delos: “Like Delphi and the Acropolis in Athens, Epidaurus and Olympus, Delos is a site crucial to the credibility of the World Heritage List.” (ICOMOS 1989a, 19)– it seems to lead to the conclusion that these institutions deem the Greek Classical heritage to be the very embodiment of this western view of global significance.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

Main question

_are the changing attitudes towards the Greek past through time reflected in the Greek World Heritage List?_

The attitudes towards the Greek past seem to be partially reflected in the Greek World Heritage List. There has been a clear growth of interest in the Greek Byzantine past in the second half of the 20th century, which is reflected by the inclusion of six sites representing the Byzantine and Post-Byzantine periods (three inscribed in 1988, and the other three inscribed in 1989, 1990 and 1999). With this, the Byzantine past is the second-best represented period on the Greek World Heritage List. The Classical past dominates the list with eight out of seventeen inscribed properties. The inscriptions of the sites representing the Classical period is not—and in any case far less than the inscriptions of the Byzantine properties– restricted to certain listing years. Whereas in the Byzantine inscriptions a clear peak can be detected in 1988, the Classical inscriptions are spread throughout the existence of the Greeks list. At least one Classical site is nominated each listing year, with the exception of 1999 and 2007. Like mentioned before, the Prehistoric past seems to be only of interest when it can be linked with the Hellenic world (through myth or through a cultural and/or –imagined- genealogical link), with which it contributes to the continuity of Greek history. It seems to be the State Party’s as well as the Committee’s belief that the Mycenaean civilization “played a vital role in the development of the culture of Classical Greece” and the State Party deems the Mycenaean period “the most important prehistoric period of the Greek civilization” (ICOMOS 1998a, 50-54). This could lead one to the conclusion that the Mycenaean civilization is, simply put, nationally and internationally seen as the predecessor of or the “road to” the Classical civilization. This is also what the opening ceremony of the Greek summer Olympics indicates: A vision of some sort of elongated Hellas; not only incorporating the achievements of the Greeks of the Golden Era, but also those of their ancestors.

In the end, the Greek World Heritage List seems to reflect the general trend that continues to exist in Greece; there can be other periods included on the list sporadically, other histories of the Greek past incorporated in the national history every now and then, but the Classical past seems to always remain the origin of Greek society. The sites that seem to be the _lieux de mémoire_ for Greece are the ones that contain the imaginary topos of Hellenism (Hamilakis 2007, 58-61). And Greece is not the only cherisher of Hellenism, something that is reflected in the jubilating comments from ICOMOS and the Committee that adorn the justification forms of Greece’s Classical heritage. With this, the international community is equally responsible for the fact that more than half of the Greek World Heritage List is occupied by Classical sites. It seems that the acceptance of Greece as a member of the European Community in 1981 and the run-up to this union with Europe in the post-war period Karamanlis governments revived the importance of antiquity in the Greek society. This phenomenon is not restricted to Greece, for with the growth of the European Union a trend can be seen amongst its members in valuing their own national culture more as a result of “loss of individual state sovereignty” (Solomon 2007, 142). However, in Greece this own culture is thus primarily deemed to be that of the Greece of the Classical times, and with that—in the words of Peckham (2001)—this will always remain “the homeland of Greece, a promised land of origin” to which modern Greece can return (Peckham 2001, 1; Herzfeld 2002, 20).
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II LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CAME Conference of Allied Ministers of Education
This conference was created in 1942 in order to restore the educational systems of the countries under Nazi occupation. This conference made plans to create a permanent formation for promoting cooperation in educational matters in the post-war period; a United Nations Organization for Educational and Cultural Reconstruction. These plans were supported by the League of Nations and as a result the United Nations Conference for the establishment of an educational and cultural organization (ECO/CONF) was held in 1945. Here the Constitution of UNESCO was introduced and signed.

This non-profit organization is devoted to the documentation and conservation of buildings, sites and neighborhoods of the modern movement. It’s foundation in 1988 was inspired by the work of ICOMOS, who aimed for the conservation and protection of historical properties.

ICIC Committee on Intellectual Co-operation
The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation was an advisory organization for the League of Nations. It aimed at the promotion of an international exchange between scientists, researchers, teachers, artists and other intellectuals. Amongst its members were Albert Einstein, Marie Curie and Thomas Mann. Its tasks were taken over by UNESCO in 1946.

ICOMOS International Council on Monuments and Sites
An international, non-governmental organization, founded in 1965 as the result of the international adoption of the Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (the Venice Charter) in 1964. ICOMOS is dedicated to the conservation of historic monuments and sites worldwide and evaluates the cultural and mixed properties nominated for the World Heritage list. It has National Committees in 107 countries and therefore each State Party has to establish an UNESCO National Commission, in order to intermediate among UNESCO, the National Governments and the governmental institutions responsible for the nomination and protection of World Heritage sites.

IUCN International Union for the Conservation of Nature (the World Conservation Union)
An international, non-governmental organization, founded in 1948 as the International Union for the Preservation of Nature. The organization changed its name to the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources in 1956. It provides the World Heritage Committee with technical evaluations of the natural properties nominated for the World Heritage list. With over a thousand members, the IUCN has a worldwide network of specialists that report on the state of conservation of listed properties.

IUPN International Union for the Protection of Nature (converted into IUCN in 1956)

TICCIH The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage
The International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage was founded in 1973. It is an international organization which aims to study, protect, conserve and explain industrial heritage. It also serves as ICOMOS’ scientific committee for industrial heritage since 2000.
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APPENDIX 1

The first draft of the functions of UNESCO, November 4, 1946 (Valderrama 1995, 44)

1. To facilitate consultations among leaders in the educational and cultural life of all peace-loving countries;
2. To assist the free flow of ideas and information among the peoples of the world through schools, universities and other educational and research institutions [...] with special attention to the exchange of information on major educational and cultural developments;
3. To foster the growth within each country and in its relations with other countries, of educational and cultural programmes which give support to international peace and security;
4. To develop and make available educational and cultural plans and materials for such consideration and use as each country may deem appropriate;
5. To conduct and encourage research and studies on educational and cultural problems to the maintenance of peace and the advancement of human welfare;
6. To assist countries that need and request help in developing their educational and cultural activities.
APPENDIX 2

The definition of Outstanding Universal Value as used by the World Heritage Committee, in which criteria I-VI apply to cultural sites and criteria VII-X to natural sites (UNESCO 2008, 20-21)

The Committee considers a property as having outstanding universal value if the property meets one or more of the following criteria. Nominated properties shall therefore:

(i) represent a masterpiece of human creative genius;
(ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design;
(iii) bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared;
(iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history;
(v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change;
(vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria);
(vii) contain superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;
(viii) be outstanding examples representing major stages of earth’s history, including the record of life, significant on-going geological processes in the development of landforms, or significant geomorphic or physiographic features;
(ix) be outstanding examples representing significant ongoing ecological and biological processes in the evolution and development of terrestrial, fresh water, coastal and marine ecosystems and communities of plants and animals;
(x) contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation.

Additional prerequisites

78. To be deemed of outstanding universal value, a property must also meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity and must have an adequate protection and management system to ensure its safeguarding.

11 Properties nominated under criteria (i) to (vi) must meet the conditions of authenticity
**Integrity and/or authenticity**

82. Depending on the type of cultural heritage, and its cultural context, properties may be understood to meet the conditions of authenticity if their cultural values (as recognized in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention 21 nomination criteria proposed) are truthfully and credibly expressed through a variety of attributes including:
- form and design;
- materials and substance;
- use and function;
- traditions, techniques and management systems;
- location and setting;
- language, and other forms of intangible heritage;
- spirit and feeling; and
- other internal and external factors.

86. In relation to authenticity, the reconstruction of archaeological remains or historic buildings or districts is justifiable only in exceptional circumstances. Reconstruction is acceptable only on the basis of complete and detailed documentation and to no extent on conjecture.

88. Integrity is a measure of the wholeness and intactness of the natural and/or cultural heritage and its attributes. Examining the conditions of integrity, therefore requires assessing the extent to which the property:

   a) includes all elements necessary to express its outstanding universal value;
   b) is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the property’s significance;
   c) suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect.

   This should be presented in a statement of integrity.
APPENDIX 3

The definition of cultural and natural heritage as written in article 1 and 2 of the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 2008, 13)

**Article 1**
For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as “cultural heritage”;
- monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science;
- sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and of man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological points of view.

**Article 2**
For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as “natural heritage”;
- natural features consisting of physical and biological formations or groups of such formations, which are of outstanding universal value from the aesthetic or scientific point of view;
- geological and physiographical formations and precisely delineated areas which constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation;
- natural sites or precisely delineated natural areas of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty.

**Mixed cultural and natural heritage**
Properties shall be considered as “mixed cultural and natural heritage” if they satisfy a part or the whole of the definitions of both cultural and natural heritage laid out in articles 1 and 2 of the Convention.
APPENDIX 4

Adjustments in the selection criteria through the years. Adopted scheme of modifications to cultural world heritage criteria since 1980 from (van der Aa 2005) checked and verified using the database of UNESCO (van der Aa 2005, 9)

Cultural sites should:

i. represent a unique artistic achievement, [1995] a masterpiece of the [1994] human creative genius or;

ii. have exerted great considerable [1980] influence exhibit an important interchange of human values [1997], over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology [1997], monumental arts, town-planning and landscaping or landscape design [1994] or;

iii. bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or [1994] to a civilization which is living or [1997] which has disappeared or;

iv. be an outstanding example of a type of structure building [1984] or architectural [1984] or technological ensemble [1997] or landscape [1994] which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human [1994] history or;

v. be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement or land-use [1994] which is representative of a culture (or cultures), [1994] which especially when it [1994] has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change or;

vi. be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, [1994] with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works [1994] of outstanding historical universal [1980] significance.

Additional prerequisites

Cultural sites should:

a. meet the test of authenticity of design, material, workmanship or setting and in the case of cultural landscapes their distinctive character and components and;

b. have adequate legal and/or traditional protection and management mechanisms to ensure the conservation of the nominated cultural properties or cultural landscapes [1988].
APPENDIX 5

The composition of the Greek World Heritage list in 2011

Greek World Heritage Sites:
*The crossed sites were rejected

1986  Bassae, Temple of Apollo Epicurus
1987  Athens, Acropolis
1987  Delphi archaeological site
1987  Samaria Gorge National Park
1988  Rhodes, medieval city
1988  Meteora
1988  Mount Athos
1988  Thessalonika, paleochristian and Byzantine monuments
1988  Epidaurus archaeological site
1988  Lesbos, petrified forest
1989  Mystras
1989  Olympia archaeological site
1989  Santorin, Akrotori archaeological site
1990  Delos
1990  Monasteries of Daphni, Hossios Luckas and Nea Moni of Chios
1992  Samos, Pythagoreion and Heraion
1996  Vergina archaeological site
1999  Mycenae and Tiryns archaeological site
1999  Chorá, historic centre
2007  Corfu
APPENDIX 6

Top 20 States Parties with the most designated World Heritage Sites* (August 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom of Great Britain &amp; Northern Ireland</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX 7**

The composition of the World Heritage lists of the Balkan countries\(^4\) (August 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year of inscription</th>
<th>Total number of inscribed sites</th>
<th>Cultural sites</th>
<th>Natural sites</th>
<th>Mixed sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYROM</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 8

The Greek Tentative List, last revised on 31/01/2003

Properties submitted on the Tentative List
The Palace of Knossos (#) (2003)
The broader region of Mount Olympus (2003)
The Area of the Prespes Lakes: Megali and Mikri Prespa which includes Byzantine and post-Byzantine monuments (2003)