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Abstract
Greek military service is obligatory for all adult male Greek civilians. The period of being on duty ranges from nine to twelve months. During this period, civilians of all different educational and socio-economic backgrounds merge together in what might be the only experience in their lifetime to encounter such a variety of backgrounds. This mixture provides a unique opportunity for heritage training destined for all, offering an alternative to the conventional way the relation of heritage education and the military is perceived. This project, developed as a dissertation for the degree of MA in Heritage Management had varied objectives, ranging from familiarizing the trainees with the terms of "cultural heritage" to raising awareness about values and even touching upon migration and other contemporary issues. Its implementation would have the potential to help the assimilation of migrants of second generation, who were awarded with Greek citizenship recently, when called to serve. The narratives that emerged, would have served as a resource to contradict chauvinistic, anti-refugee and racial viewpoints, which were recently used by the Neo-Nazi voices of Golden Dawn in the Greek Parliament and other neo-conservatives in public discourses. The aim of this contribution is to discuss some key theoretical and methodological aspects of this project, as well as the reaction and feedback of some major stakeholders.
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RESUMEN
El servicio militar Griego es obligatorio para todos los civiles adultos varones. El tiempo de servicio varía desde 9 a 12 meses. Durante este periodo, los civiles de todos los estratos educacionales y socio-económicos se mezclan en lo que quizá pueda ser su única oportunidad de encontrar tanta variedad de orígenes. Esta mezcla provee la exepcial oportunidad de entrenamiento sobre el patrimonio destinado a todos, ofreciendo una perspectiva alternativa
1 Heritage, archaeology and the military: a timely equation

On they fight, for they’re right
Yes, but who’s to say?
For a hill, men would kill
Why? They do not know
Stiffened wounds test their pride.
Metallica, For whom the bell tolls, 1984

The relationship between heritage and the military is obscure and much debated in governmental and academic circles. From UNESCO’s recent campaign in social media concerning ISIS’ destruction of Syrian monuments (#UNITE4HERITAGE) and going as far as the deeper debates such as the role of the archaeologists during periods of armed conflict, (World Archaeological Congress (WAC) of 2008), armed operations play a pivotal role. The military exercises command over land, attacks or protects, and therefore by definition is the ultimate body responsible for the destruction or the safeguarding of antiquities.

It was the debate between two different ontological approaches that sparked the interest for the creation of this project. The ideas of Umberto Albarella (2009) and Yannis Hamilakis (2009), as expressed in their emerging papers from WAC 2008, contradicted the approach of Peter Stone (2005) regarding the role of archaeologists during periods of war. Stone suggested that heritage practitioners should cooperate with the military during wartime in order to inform troops and rescue antiquities in the event of invasions. His
personal experience shaped this approach, as he had cooperated with the British Government in order to create a plan on how to prevent destruction and looting during the invasion of Iraq by the US and UK “coalition forces” (Stone 2005). The outcome was not the expected one since destruction and looting took place and Stone (2005: 938) doesn’t deny this fact, supported by the wider literature and statistics\(^1\) as well. During the consulting process, Stone (2005: 937) suggested to the British military three measures for the protection of Iraqi antiquities: no looting should take place by the invaders; the forces should cooperate with the Iraq Department of Antiquities, in a joint effort to save Iraqi heritage, and post-conflict aid should be sent to Iraq, hence, restoring damaged monuments, following the initiatives taken by local archaeologists.

This approach was criticized on the grounds that it legitimizes neo-imperialistic wars and neo-colonial attitudes. Amongst others, Albarella (2009) and Hamilakis (2009), believe that archaeologists and heritage practitioners ought to resist being co-opted in any planned military operation, a position adopted by the plenary session of WAC in 2008. For Albarella, the cooperation of archaeologists with the military in the case of Iraq, legitimized the war through the establishment of “non-interference” archaeological zones, which was approved and implemented by the UN, thus legitimizing an otherwise illegal operation (Albarella 2008: 107).

Hamilakis (2009) promotes political activism as a potential solution. He argues that archaeologists should not withdraw in situations of warfare, neither should they cooperate with the military. To the contrary, they should engage with a critical analysis that safeguards the autonomy of the scholar. Therefore, the professional should criticize the political agenda and the power structures of contemporary warfare (imperialism), deconstructing their ideological overtones and showing war’s catastrophic consequences (Hamilakis 2009: 39). Furthermore, he suggests that archaeologists and heritage professionals have failed to articulate a political and ethical response to the “war on terror”, the reason being that academia has stayed behind the narrowly defined sense of professional duty (Hamilakis 2009: 41).

The opposition between “technocrats”, striving to aid the military without spending much thought on the wider results of their actions, and “intellectuals”, denying the role-model of archaeologists as “saviors of material remains” while interpreting the “technocrat” stance as a legitimizer of war, according to Albarella’s division (2008: 108), cannot meet in the middle, creating thus a

\(^1\)John Warren (2008) raises the concern that in the Iraqi case 7000 years of continuous civilization in this part of the world were destroyed partly because of countries considered pioneers in the fields of cultural heritage and archaeology. Highlighting the lack of preventive forces inside Baghdad Museum and bearing in mind the wider political and economic grounds behind the invasion, he concludes that coalition forces mismanaged the situation and their attempts to safeguard heritage, with the aid of professionals, failed.
bipolar argument. Both sides firmly suggest that they hold an active stance towards the safeguarding of antiquities in periods of crisis, while the power to defend heritage remains in military’s hands.

Yet, looting and destructions happen more readily than the WAC debate suggests, as witnessed during events in Syria, caused by ISIS, and even more recently. In Iraq, the coalition forces used archaeological sites that were key points in the landscape as strongholds and camps to “win the fight over terrorism”. Striking is the example of Babylon where 300,000 square meters of the site were flattened for military purposes\(^2\). It also failed in providing an ideological argument for the legitimation of the economic wars of western capitalism, as the “intellectual” approach suggests. Although appealing, this “intellectual” approach itself has proven to be unfruitful since political activism, strongly suggested by the scholars, remains in print, in books, papers, proceedings and petitions, unable to influence the field. Even though the choice of not engaging with the military is conscious, armed conflicts and wars multiply and the results remain the same.

Svec (2014) addressed the lack of cultural heritage training within the US military. Being director of military programs in NASA ames research center, she engaged with educating US military forces on heritage-related issues. This approach is slightly different than the “hands on” approach that creates case specific action plans to save cultural heritage sites in times of invasions, as it focusses on heritage education of a wider perspective, prior to any military engagement. Svec conducted two different research activities and concluded that there is much room for improvement since “participants (soldiers of the US military) somewhat knew the value of cultural heritage and were less than somewhat aware of laws on protection” (Svec 2014).

Svec’s suggestions on the importance of heritage training in the military emerges from pure logistics, in the sense that she regards “cultural competencies” to be a vital part of military missions furthering them, saving resources and lives. Although the “technocratic” intervention approach shares the same ideology with Svec’s idea, there is one fundamental difference: the second case aims to educate military stakeholders in peace time, hence pointing towards a potentially different approach that will be outlined below.

2 A third approach?

The efforts to connect heritage studies to the military, as generally outlined above by using the examples of Stone (2005) and Svec (2014), can be traced back to the classic school of managers as scientists, originating in the thoughts of Taylor during the 1920’s. According to this idea, methodologies may be decomposed into measurable units of activity, targeting to fulfil well

\(^2\) [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/4177577.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/4177577.stm) (Date of access: 11.06.2016, time 01:16)
defined targets. For Svec (2014) “heritage preservation is a force multiplier and offers the opportunity to aid in rebuilding relations within countries” while “cultural property and its protection is a matter of law, heritage, human rights and strategy”. Therefore, she developed a body of techniques to address the matter of law, as soldiers would be held accountable for their actions no matter whether they are aware or unaware of the law.

This hands-on approach, regarding managers as on-line experimenters, scientists in action, whose practice would consist of the trial and measurement of designs and methods aimed at the implementation of the best practice (Schön & DeSanctis 1986: 237-238) reveals a problem solving operational chain that moves away from the dialectic nature of heritage, and its synthetic analysis in terms of values and complex narratives. Bearing in mind that management as science saw a big rise in the outbreak of World War II (WWII), with the birth of operational research (Schön & DeSanctis 1986: 238), it is clear that heritage methodologies are being reduced to the military demands if this specific scientific hands-on approach is selected. In other words, it is a process conforming heritage to military rules and demands.

Bringing the discussion to the Greek case a different possibility will be presented. Military is omnipresent in the Greek public discourse during peace times, in the forms of formal military parades, compulsory military service for all male adults, and dominant nationalistic ideologies expressed by military personnel. The Greek military has largely abstained from big post WWII wars, exceptions being Kosovo and Korea. Therefore, a relationship between heritage and the military has to be established in cases of non-intervention for obvious reasons. Greece absented from wars and is not one of the major military forces worldwide. This context allows the methodologies of heritage management to use the military as an apparatus for the diffusion of knowledge through education and not vice versa, such as for utilitarian military purposes, as in the above examples.

The Greek case therefore presents a chance to investigate different potential relations between heritage and the army. Although, Greek formal military cannot be considered as a progressive institution, especially since the memories from the last military regime (1967-1973) are still fresh. In a country with such a deep interest in antiquity, the military shared this empathy mainly through a nationalistic perspective, using it as a tool to “rehabilitate” leftists and partisans to the right path (Hamilakis 2002), amongst other. Nevertheless, since left-wing Syriza won the elections in 2014, many believed that a wider democratization could emerge. Thus, a proposal to implement a heritage education program inside this institution seemed intriguing. In 2015, I was on track to fulfill my MA in Heritage Management and had to complete my compulsory military service as well. The decision was made to combine the two and make a case for the implementation of a heritage educational program in the Greek military. What seemed to be a utopian project from the beginning, was presented as an idea and bears the acknowledgement and the support of
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2.1 The concept

All Greek male civilians are obliged to fulfill their military duty between the ages of 18 and 35. Duty time ranges from nine to twelve months of training. During this period, people of diverse educational and socio-economic backgrounds merge together in what might be the only experience in their lifetime for encountering people from such a variety of backgrounds (e.g. high school graduates mix with graduate and Post-Docs students; young adults of Greek ethnicity intertwined with assimilated Greeks of different ethnic roots etc.). This environment provides a unique opportunity for heritage training destined for a top-down approach, revealing the potential to bridge what seems to be two totally different aspects, rarely overlapping with each other in periods of peace and usually considered opposites: the conservative attitudes that the military, as an institution is embedded with, and the dialectic nature that heritage possess as a discipline, display in principle no imperialistic or interventional agendas.

The project created a theoretical background for the realization of a series of small educational films that would serve to educate military trainees on heritage issues. Primarily, it would familiarize trainees with the term of “cultural heritage” by outlining the methods that military forces used in order to save heritage during periods of war throughout time. Examples were drawn from both Greek and international experiences.

The second aim was related to a complex issue, within the scope of heritage studies and public engagement, related to diverse scientific narratives. It emerged as a response to one of the liberal and enlightened legislative acts of the Syriza government, who awarded Greek citizenship status to children of immigrants who were born in Greece\(^3\). The target was to create heritage narratives focusing on the open and receiving character and the multicultural background of the civilizations that arose in Greece from prehistory onwards, emphasizing on the historical movements of populations, ideas and material culture. This way children awarded with the Greek citizenship, when summoned to fulfill their military obligation, would have been able to adapt in a national narrative that engages people of varied ethnic backgrounds, enabling a different potential mode of assimilation. These narratives would contradict chauvinist narratives, spread throughout the Greek educational system and the anachronistic beliefs that young men have to endure during their military

training. The emerging narratives shouldn't challenge the dominant perspectives directly, since it would have been unrealistic to create an educational program that deconstructs dominant aspects of the national narrative. Therefore, another method was introduced. Most of the subjects chosen were marginalized by the dominant narration and were selected exactly because they had the potential to point to different directions than chauvinistic, homophobic and racist narrations.

For the above, this project was regarded timely and of high importance for a country that faced, and still does, huge refugee waves, and facing increased Neo-Nazi ideologies. Furthermore, since according to Eurostat Greece is occupying one of the last places in lifelong learning (4% in 2016) and is one of the last countries in the Eurozone that students still abandon high school, this program had the potential to produce a paradigm shift, keeping in mind that the number of young adults that would have followed it is enormous -all Greek male civilians. Education is considered one of the main pillars to create an understanding and nuance differences in a period of crisis and rising of the extremes, and this setting was unique to prove that in the darkest hours, miracles can happen.

3 Some case studies from the project

3.1 War, military and the protection of heritage: a historical case

During wartime, one of the most valued resources is cultural heritage. In this context, approaches towards heritage fuel debates from the case of the Bamiyan Buddhas to the destructions of ISIS in Palmyra and the assassination of the archaeologist in charge of the site. This first case wishes to highlight one good practice that was incorporated in the project.

The example comes from 1940 and the efforts of the Greek government and the Ephorate of Antiquities to protect the treasures of the National Archaeological Museum (NAM) from the war and the Germans that were about to invade the country. Although the discussion for the protection of antiquities had already begun in 1937 in the form of a dialogue between the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs with other government bodies, this early effort was pushed forward by the actual events. A group of archaeologists, public servants and volunteers gathered in the NAM as the threat of Nazi troops marching towards Athens was imminent. The antiquities were divided into

---

4 A personal note from the author's military service. During this month of “education” were forced to listen the lecture of an orthodox priest with the rank of lieutenant colonel, arguing that homosexuality is a mind sickness that can be cured through the path of God.

groups and different actions were taken depending on the artefacts’ material composition. Marble statues were wrapped with geotextile to avoid destruction caused by humidity and stored underground in ditches especially prepared for this reason. Clay and copper objects were put into boxes sealed with wax to create the environment on which damages from underground deposits would be minimal to the objects. This action is a manifest of how important the cultural capital of a country is and reveals an interesting way on how to protect heritage in conflicted periods. Furthermore, it acknowledges the pragmatic value of objects, as valuable artefacts made from precious metals, e.g. the golden jewelry from the tombs of Mycenae, were put in sealed boxes that were handed over to the vaults of the Bank of Greece (Paschalidis 2013). When the German troops arrived, they found NAM empty and reused the building for their own administrative purposes, hence installing their own governmental services.

The above example showcases how the organized government reacted to safeguard its antiquities in short notice before Nazi troops marched in Athens, a city of great ideological importance to the Third Reich. It outlines a practice that was destined to defend the country’s heritage against a military invasion. Even though the Ministry of Defense was not a part of the endeavor, it is important to reveal to the audience that such actions may be taken in cases of crisis. Communicating the knowledge of such studies educate and might even inspire young individuals and inform the reactions of troops.

3.2 Heritage, history and archaeology through military training

During the first month of training, lectures are given on subjects ranging from the effects of drug abuse and irresponsible driving, to the most extreme case of orthodox priests delivering speeches of hatred against refugees, LGBTQ+ (see footnote 5) and other minorities. Evidently, this is a hostile environment for heritage and the wider humanities. This second chapter offers an educational perspective to challenge the above series of lectures and replace them by different heritage topics, following the methodology identified earlier.

Historical and archaeological narratives are the ones that might bring about the change for two reasons. First, in many cases, as it will be shown below, history is taught in Greek schools from an ethnocentric perspective, creating misconceptions and sometimes highlighting discrimination. Nevertheless, due to their dialectic nature, history and archaeology may produce the counter-narratives needed to twist the values from ethnocentrism to a wider understanding of civilization. Thus, the experiment is to involve two of the most conservative aspects of Greek society, curricular history and military education, to propose alternatives that could lead to a different understanding of heritage for trainees. What follows is the outline of two case studies.
3.2.1 Paleolithic Period

3.2.1a Identifying the problematic narration: the Petralona skull

A major Paleolithic controversy is related to a skull, found inside Petralona cave, that has remained one of the “most bitterly debated questions in Balkan prehistory” (Galanidou 2004: 1). It was discovered by a shepherd in 1960 inside the Petralona cave of northern Greece, therefore leaving, the context of discovery elusive for archaeologists and providing fertile ground for speculation. The shepherd allegedly located the skull and extracted it from a stalagmite (Kourtesi-Phillipakis 1986: 45).

Although today it is commonly accepted that the Petralona skull belongs to a Homo *heidelbergensis* (Galanidou 2004: 2), the quest for its dating went through many waves, in the margins of science and into the realm of politics. Aris Poulianos, the site’s main excavator began his excavations in 1968, claiming that the first Homo *erectus* was a “Macedon” 700000 years old, in a theory that was supposed to deconstruct the *out of Africa* model of early hominin dispersal. This theory was in tune with the ideology of the Junta (1967-1973), aiming to use archaeological narratives to argue for Greek superiority over its neighbors in both cultural and genetic terms. If therefore Petralona skull was the *Urheimat* of Homo *erectus*, this leads to the suggestion that the first “Archanthropus” was Greek (newspaper Macedonia, v. 148, 18/04/1968).

Equally important are the names assigned to cave chambers. One of them was named Aristotle, in order to pay due to the “father of anthropology, who, 2000 years before Darwin created the scale of the evolution of life, placing man on the pyramid’s top” (YNEΔ 1977). The path leading to the chamber of the skull was named by Poulianos *Pillars of Hercules* (YNEΔ 1977). These names manifest the ideology behind this narrative, assigning Hellenic values to a Paleolithic context, transforming it into a vital part of the national narrative. Aristotle viewed as the “father of anthropology”, incorporates this science to the large list of gifts the Greeks bore to the world, while the *Pillars of Hercules* are the gates to the Greek realm, the chamber of the skull, the first *Urheimat*. This chamber is named *Mausoleum*, with direct relation to one of the seven wonders of the ancient world – the tomb of Mausolus in Halicarnassus. It is easy to perceive the naming process as a rite of passage, created to initiate the visitor to the forgotten realm of the first Greek. The itinerary begins with Aristotle, the most influential ancient Greek philosopher for the post-enlightenment Western thought and moves through Hercules’ Pillars to the “Greek mare nostrum”, the earliest Greek ancestor that is also of universal significance. An idea analogous to the significance of Aristotle and Gibraltar.

It took only eight pages for two researchers from Cambridge to deconstruct all the dating arguments that had been put forward, only by

---

6 I would like to thank Georgia Beka for bringing this information to my attention.
reflecting on the methodological errors that had occurred during the sampling processes of Poulianos’ associates (Wintle and Jacobs 1982). For the Uranium Series Dating, they commented that for the chamber of the “Mausoleum”, where the skull is said to have been found, the ages obtained had large error bars ranging from 200,000 to ∞. They concluded that “since the 22 samples represent 10 different areas of the cave and fail to reach the basic criteria for the method to be acceptable, it is not possible to use the data to date the development of the formations of the cave, let alone use the results to date the skull” (Wintle and Jacobs 1982: 41). Regarding Thermoluminescence, dating they challenge its reliability in this case, since before operating this method to date a site of such controversy, studies on calcite of known age must have taken place for comparison (Wintle and Jacobs 1982) and – surprisingly – this was not the Petralona case. They deconstructed, furthermore, the ESR method applied on the site and reminded the scientific audience that a PhD student of Edinburgh University studied six samples from Petralona which he excluded from his thesis since they weren’t capable of providing safe results.

This short article was enough to deconstruct – in scientific terms – a theory that challenges the “out of Africa” model suggesting that the origins of Homo were European and not African – based on only one skull. Kourtesi-Phillipakis (1986) is so politically correct that she avoids even mentioning Poulianos’ dating. Nevertheless, these dating appears in the governmental website of the district of Chalkidiki7. It may suggest that lack of public engagement by academics, is one of the main reasons that gave rise to most conspiracy theorists, preachers of white-pride resurrection and Greek nationalists. These people created countless articles and blogs unravelling this mystery that conventional archaeology and academia is hiding from the public8.

Poulianos narrative continued to be popular after the fall of the regime, as he conducted research inside the cave for many years in the post-junta period. This is proven on 1981 by on site visit of Konstantinos Karamanlis and Valéry Giscard d’Estaing. The presidents of the Greek and French Republics congratulated Poulianos’ team on site the same year that late minister of Culture, Melina Mercouri, had given to the excavator an unlimited research permit (newspaper Acropolis, 12/12/1981)9.

In 1977, four years after the regime’s fall, the Armed Forces Information Services (YΕΝΕΔ) created a documentary on the “Archanthropus of Petralona”. Ironically enough this documentary may be considered the forefather of this project: a documentary to educate the troops on a heritage

---

7 http://www.halkidiki.gov.gr/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=16 (Date of access: 20/10/16; Time of access: 01:58)
8 E.g.: http://www.ancient-origins.net/news-history-archaeology-opinion-guest-authors/new-information-petralona-skull-controversy-001380 (Date of access: 20/10/16; Time of access: 01:58)
9 I would like to thank Georgia Beka for bringing this information to my attention.
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matter. Because of the heavy controversy, YENΕΔ never broadcasted the documentary that can be found nowadays circulating on YouTube. Had this endeavour succeeded, military trainees and personnel would have learned about the Greek Archanthropus, its environment and habits 700000 years BP (!).

3.2.1b Revealing another reality

The Petralona skull narrative is the best example possible to showcase how science is intertwined with politics. YΕΝΕΔ's documentary would have achieved the exact opposite goal of this project, using the same means: heritage training in the military. But this contribution suggests that archaeology has the potential to bring an original perspective upon common problems. Thus, the idea evaluated as a counter paradigm to the dangerous Petralona narration is the promotion of another Paleolithic excavation in context.

The Lower Paleolithic site of Rodafnifia in Lesvos is a very convenient example. It is excavated by the University of Crete and the research team shows interest also towards Public Archaeology. Furthermore, it is a site of great Palaeolithic importance as it is the area possessing some of the earliest evidence of human presence in the Aegean, the Greek mainland and the Southern Balkans (Galanidou et. al. 2013), while its Acheulean artifact types predate the Petralona skull. It is the northwestern-most outpost to the distribution Lower Paleolithic sites along the Levantine corridor, raising the question of hominin 'out of Asia' and 'out of Africa' dispersal (Galanidou 2014: 14).

This narration focusses on the hominin dispersals and the material culture parallels between Rodafnidia and the sites on the coast of Turkey and the Central Anatolian site of Kaletepe Delesi (Galanidou 2014: 15). Not only it provides the scientific insights needed to contradict the Petralona narrative without showing specific interest in its deconstruction, but it has the potential to reveal a good Public Archaeology practice, since community engagement is one of the main interests of the university team. Rodafnidia provided yet another challenge to dialectically approach the Homo erectus movements and the contemporary refugee itineraries towards their salvation in the E.U, highlighting the longue durée of human mobility and interaction...

3.2.2 Bronze Age

3.2.2a The canonical view of Bronze Age

Regarding the Bronze Age assessment of stereotypes, focus was given to those transmitted through the school curriculum. Judging from the textbooks, two are the main problems regarding the Bronze Age narrations. First, the archaeological knowledge provided is outdated. Reading between the
textbook’s lines it is easy to point out the Victorian perceptions on the Minoan past, such as the existence of a King called Minos (Primary School, 4th Grade Textbook). Moreover, geographical determinism is promoted as one of the main factors judging whether a civilization will become important or not. This way, Cretan geography as the island is situated in the center of the Mediterranean (Primary School, 3rd Grade Textbook) (sic.) is what helped the Minoans create their thalassocracy (Primary School, 3rd Grade Textbook). The same determinism is expressed regarding interpretations on the collapse of civilizations. This occurs only by natural disasters – such as the eruption of Thera that weakened the Minoan civilization acting as a stimulating factor for the Mycenaean conquest of Crete – or by the invasion of superior stocks of people – such as the Dorians (Primary School, 4th Grade Textbook) in the case of the Mycenaean. It may be the case that the theories of Evans, Marinatos and others have been disproved or seriously challenged within the realms of contemporary archaeological theory and thinking, yet younger generations continue to be educated under the auspices of a public educational system which, unfortunately, promotes these narratives.

The second aspect to bear in mind is that school curriculum provides erroneous information to children. Although an error is subject to correction by peer-reviewers and book re-evaluations the books, some errors resist time and become given. As a result, in the long run we are telling lies to the children, ranging from the most basic fact that Crete does not lie in the center of the Mediterranean to the statement that Evans was the first excavator of Knossos (Primary School, 3rd Grade Textbook), instead of Minos Kalokairinos.

Cultural-historical methodological approaches are still used to produce those narratives which fuel the notions of nation-states with national pride. It is such a great paradox though that Greeks draw pride by promoting Evans, a Victorian, as the first excavator of Knossos instead of the Greek Minos Kalokairinos. We are in front of a case of inverse colonialism, since the Greek State sought legitimation through its past, filtered through the lens of 19th and early 20th century Western Scholars. In this sense, it is more important that Evans modelled the Minoans to Victorian Britain, than Kalokairinos, who stopped his excavations so that antiquities wouldn’t fall into the hands of the Ottoman Empire.

Another example is the way the Modern Greek state establishes its close ties with Cyprus through the Bronze Age. According to the methodology summoned, Mycenaean pottery found on the island is fundamental in order to argue for a Mycenaean colonization of Cyprus rather than accepting the complexity of the Cypriot Bronze Age. The same applies for the case of Minoan thalassocracy that emerged from Evans’ projection of Victorian England to Bronze Age Crete, identifying Minoans as the first European civilization. If we follow the same line of argument, it may be suggested that no nation-state possessing in its territory the “first European civilization” would ever select to alter the narration towards more complex and contemporary archaeological
realities. Therefore, it is suggested that as long as the state does not take the responsibility to update the curriculum in the light of current research, these narratives are left as such because they serve political purposes – notably the forging of the traditional Greek national identity. In other words, the absence of political initiative to alter the cultural historical scientific interpretations is considered a political stance towards a “nation-building” and ethnocentric historical narration.

3.2.2b Bronze Age under a world system perspective

The Greek archaeologist Keramopoullos (1930) was ahead of his time when he argued that merchants would acquire all valuable and profitable products from one market (or workshop) and – if they would profit from selling the products to other markets – would return. Maybe in exchange for the commodities they obtained, they would trade something of value, exotic to the given market such as metal (Keramopoullos 1930: 37), hinting at an early stage the importance of metal trade of the Late Bronze Age.

It is important to stress those early suggestions, made by Keramopoullos for two reasons. First, in this case one should stress the intellectual capital of Greek archaeologists as in the narration of the textbooks, the only names of archaeologists mentioned are those of Arthur Evans and Heinrich Schliemann. Keramopoullos’ views on trade, is important as it reveals patterns of Mycenaean interconnections and not excellence. The idea is to combine those “indigenous” scientific approaches with very important discoveries that strengthen their scientific accuracy and, therefore, value. What Keramopoullos only began to articulate can be combined with archaeological stories that engage the public with alternative narrations.

The medium chosen to communicate different prehistoric narrative, based on the Mediterranean network systems, is trade and travel as manifested through the words of Menelaus in the Odyssey and the archaeological example of shipwrecks. The narrative is built around those resources for various reasons. Odyssey is a familiar scenery for most Greeks while shipwrecks have the potential to excite a wide audience providing thus two easy ways to navigate through new information easier. Menelaus described one of his journeys in the Odyssey as such:

“For of a truth after many woes and wide wanderings I brought my wealth home in my ships and came in the eighth year. Over Cyprus and Phoenicia, I wandered, and Egypt, and I came to the Ethiopians and the Sidonians and the Erebe, and to Libya, where the lambs are horned from their birth.” (od. 4.75-85)

This picture is complemented by data from the Uluburun and Cape Gelidonya shipwrecks that reveal the circulation of goods, merchants and mercenaries throughout the Mediterranean (Cline & Yasur-Landau 207; Pulak 1998; Sherratt and Sherratt 1991).
Conclusion

This paper tried to outline an alternative point of view on how troops can be educated in order to understand the values of multiple heritages – and therefore respect them during armed conflicts. Furthermore, it suggested how to use the military to implement heritage education programs for wide audiences during peace time. Unfortunately, the promotion of the values of equality and multivocality, are more important than ever. The potential implementation of this program within the military might create an alternative to the strong conservative reflexes that are being generated in the Greek society, more and more often, while it could act like food for thought for other contexts.
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