
*Culture and Perspective at Times of Crisis* begins with a question: ‘Do you care about the past?’ (p. 1, ‘Introduction’ by Antoniadou et al.). Starting a book with a question to the reader is definitely a strong way to catch the reader’s interest and curiosity. In this publication, though, the question also works as a clever medium to introduce the key argument of the book: the important role the public and the individual should play in cultural heritage management primarily in times of crisis but also in periods of affluence. Debates about heritage interpretation, heritage ownership, and the role of the public in heritage management and preservation dominated the discussion around cultural heritage in the 1990s (e.g. Skeates, 2000; Howard, 2003). These debates capitalised all the discussion taking place at the time on agency, the role of the public, and the introduction in heritage studies of management practices and ideas.

Nowadays, at the beginning of the third decade of the twenty-first century, the discussion has moved on to the importance of heritage for the public, as shown by the varied applications of heritage to education, to mental health research, and to community engagement, to name just a few (e.g. Cozzani et al., 2017). However, the edited volume here reviewed is surprisingly relevant for two main reasons. Firstly, it is an outcome of the economic and social crisis that hit the Eurozone after 2010, and it is aligned with current debates on post-crisis cultural heritage management policies in Europe’s south (see Corredor & Bustamante, 2019 for Spain; Rubio Arostegui & Rius-Ulldemolins, 2020 for a review of Portugal, Spain, Italy, and Greece). Secondly, it adds the Greek case study to the global discussion of good practice on heritage interpretation, preservation, and management. The Greek debate about the different roles that the state, stakeholders, and the public should have, had been pervasive within the Greek disciplinary landscape (see the excellent reviews in Papadimitriou & Anagnostopoulos, 2017) with only minimal or topic-restrictive publications available to the wider academic world (with important exceptions, such as Hamilakis, 2007).

Heritage recording, interpretation, and management in Greece was always a state organised affair. The Greek Archaeological Service, established in 1833, is the oldest agency of its kind
in Europe and is the de jure authority in the overall research and management of cultural heritage in Greece. There has been a vibrant discussion in Greece during the last ten years or so regarding the value of stakeholders and the importance of public engagement in heritage management and interpretation. This debate is an overarching theme of the publication under review, and is explicitly discussed by Vavouranakis (Ch. 2), Giannitsioti et al. (Ch. 4), and Gazi (Ch. 9). As Vavouranakis states in his chapter (pp. 26–28), the Greek crisis polarized heritage management into a state versus private debate. The lack of state funding for archaeological and heritage management work encouraged supporters of private initiatives to make a case for partial ‘privatisation’ of cultural heritage management in Greece in order to create a funding flow towards heritage recording and preservation. As Vavouranakis concludes (pp. 35–36), despite a long tradition of state regulation, an unregulated field of privately funded heritage management initiatives has developed over the last twenty years, with an accelerated pace during the period of the economic crisis. What Vavouranakis proposes is that, while state organised regulation needs to remain in place, there is a need for regulation of private initiatives, as well as encouragement of further private investment in Greek heritage.

Giannitsioti and colleagues and Gazi (Chs 4 and 9, respectively) further explore the public versus private debate in the Greek context. Giannitsioti and her co-authors discuss private initiatives in cultural tourism and the role of the state. The importance of cultural heritage for the tourism industry in Greece has been a recurring theme in the news and in the academic discourse, in Greece and beyond (e.g. Nilsson, 2018). Giannitsioti et al. propose a middle-ground approach between the inflexible and financially restricted state and the ‘booming private sector’. The advantage of further private investment would be a framework that allows synergies between different stakeholders, the state, the local communities, and the wider public. This chapter clearly exposes the challenges of the absence of a coherent mitigation strategy to compensate the imbalance between private versus state investment. However, towards the end of the chapter, examples of how such synergies might work in Greece but also in similar contexts around the Mediterranean and beyond, could have been presented. Similarly, Gazi’s chapter advocates for the creation of synergies, especially those that go beyond the private/state approach and incorporate the communities, charities, NGOs, the wider public, and other stakeholders. Ideas about community ‘co-production’ of cultural heritage assets are not novel, and Gazi manages to nicely incorporate the Greek case into the global scholarship on the topic. By examining Greek examples of state-private-wider public
synergies, such as the DIAZOMA and the DemoCU projects (p. 139) alongside successful participatory projects from other European countries, Gazi outlines a coherent framework that states, organisations, and public groups could follow.

The advantage of Gazi’s chapter is that it incorporates the Greek case study within a broader disciplinary landscape, something that, unfortunately, certain chapters of the volume are missing. Poulios and Arampatzis’ chapter (3) is a good example, since it discusses the involvement of the private sector in commercial, development-driven archaeology within the Greek context. Prior to the economic crisis, the Archaeological Service used to undertake all heritage mitigation activities for commercial development projects in Greece. Since 2010, developers have been commissioning part of the archaeological work, including hiring the field archaeologists, privately, a practice that has sparked a vibrant debate in the country. Poulios and Arampatzis’ chapter, discussing project management models and frameworks, may be a valuable addition to the Greek debate, and a useful practical case study for countries like Italy when similar discussions take place. However, it would have been important to place the Greek case within the global debate about private mitigation of the heritage aspect of commercial development by incorporating case studies from abroad, particularly from countries where private companies undertake the archaeological work (e.g. Darvill et al., 2019 for the UK; Smith & Burke, 2007 for Australia). Similarly, Adamopoulou’s chapter (9) may be invaluable for a Greek reader, since it deals with the oxymoron of Greeks that are very proud of their heritage but who find visits to heritage sites and engagement with heritage assets boring and tiresome. Her proposals for the wider introduction of cultural heritage into the school curriculum and new heritage communication practices drawn from established examples in other countries, are really interesting and important for countries with similar issues—such as Italy—but coming short of advancing further the disciplinary discussion.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 (by Mouliou, Hatzaki, and Loizou Hadjigravriel respectively) all focus on the role of museums in the context of post-crisis Greece. From all three chapters, what stands out is Hatzaki’s discussion placing privately funded venues in Greek museums on the spot and arguing for the importance of such venues for expanding public engagement. Louizou Hadjigavriel’s chapter is also interesting. It brings into the discussion the example of the Leventis Municipal Museum from Cyprus, the only non-Greek example in the volume under review. The Nicosia-based museum is a good practice example for a state-private joint
venture in the Hellenic world and has the potential to influence policy change in Greece as well.

The volume also incorporates chapters by Carman and Dallas (Chs 1 and 8, respectively). Carman’s chapter works as a second introduction to the volume, presenting the global landscape of heritage management practice, while praising the importance of synergies between the different stakeholders for the optimal interpretation and management of heritage assets. Dallas’ chapter explores digital heritage in post-crisis Greece and the role of social media. Different aspects of social media usage among stake organisations, private institutions, and public groups are analysed. Discussions about the agency of digital heritage and the collective memories that prompt heritage ownership make in Dallas’ work a fascinating read.

*Culture and Perspective at Times of Crisis* is a collective work that advocates synergies between the private and the public spheres as the optimal way for heritage management in economically disadvantaged contexts. For the authors of the volume, heritage is public, belongs to the community and, thus, heritage management should be community-driven. Moreover, since the community is represented through multiple stakeholders, including the state, all the different partners should be engaged equally. However, a clear proposal for a framework on how these synergies can be organised around the different aspects of heritage is missing. Additionally, some chapters placing the Greek case study within broader, international debates on the topics each of the chapters addresses, would have been necessary. This lack of broader contextualization limits the value of some of the chapters, as they are either oriented to the Greece-focused readership or present Greece as case study.

The volume may be slightly restricted in terms of coverage. However, the editors and the authors have very diverse backgrounds within the heritage profession, and they include academics, private initiative managers, and museum curators. Thus, diverse perspectives about heritage management are represented in the book, and the reader will be able to explore different aspects and dimensions of the synergies that the volume advocates. It is important to circulate this volume widely across the countries hit by the Eurozone crisis and the post Covid-19 word, and in contexts where heritage management practices are still exclusively organised by the state. The latter could benefit from the proposed strategies for creating synergies, to further engage stakeholders and the wider public into their heritage management
practices. Specialists on crisis management and policy makers, in addition to heritage professionals, may also find the volume an interesting and valuable read.
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