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Abstract

Realisations of Performance in Contemporary Greek Art

This is the first study to approach, both historically and theoretically, the emergence and development of performance art in Greece from the 1970s to the 2010s. Drawing on an interdisciplinary framework—including feminist theory, philosophy, sociology, art history, and more—the study aims to address an evident gap in histories of contemporary Greek art. The research begins with the emergence of performative artistic practices in the 1970s, in the conditions set out by the seven-year Dictatorship (1967-1974) and follows, selectively, the complex trajectory of these practices while investigating their connection with wider socio-political and economic developments. The thesis should not be read as a survey, despite being the first book-length analysis of Greek performance art in both English and Greek. The material included here has been selective (drawn out of years of field research) and yet presents, and represents, the spectrum of themes and positions making up the history of performance art in Greece.

My contention is that the rise and establishment of performance art in Greece reflected both the political ferment of the time (early 1970s) and an enquiry into the possibility of flight from traditional media. The dual aim of this study is, first, to facilitate and encourage the integration of performance art in a revised Greek art history; and, second, to contribute to an expansion of performance art histories in an international context through the negotiation of hitherto unknown material synthesised in a study of adequate length.

This thesis has required large-scale in situ research and overcoming the major obstacle of the absence of relevant publicly held archives. This was one reason why even an elementary linear history of performance art had been such an overwhelming task in the past; a second reason is the overall marginalisation of performance art theory in the Greek context. Through the Greek paradigm, the thesis illuminates new aspects not only of performance but also of post-performative participatory practices, engaging new conceptualisations. By identifying fundamental issues in the production, dissemination, and reception of performance art in Greece, I provide a critical analysis not only of its achievements and potential but also of its impasses and failures. My intention in undertaking this research has been to disprove the notion—implied or stated as a matter of fact in histories of contemporary Greek art—that performance art has had only a sporadic and inconsistent presence in this ‘periphery’ scene. I
argue that the artists investigated in this study are conclusively part of the history of performance in the 20th and 21st centuries, thereby setting the terms and calling for further research on the subject.
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Introduction

1. Research Aims, Questions and Methods

The aim of this thesis is to address a significant gap in the histories of Greek performance art by considering realisations of performance art in relation to the concerns and issues of their larger cultural and socio-political contexts. Although performance art has been extensively explored since the 1960s in North and South America and most European countries, it has remained marginalised in—unless it was simply excised from—Greek art histories. At the time of writing, no book length study of Greek performance art exists in Greek or any other language and I have not located any doctoral thesis focused on the subject either. Overall, published research on contemporary Greek art does not offer a sustained analysis of performance art. My research aims, therefore, to shed light on the emergence and evolution of performance art in Greece; to investigate its particularities; to trace its relation to, similarities with, performance art in Europe. The study considers works from the early 1970s, when the earliest performances are recorded in Greece, to the 2010s.¹

The central thesis of this study argues that a) performance art and its diverse manifestations in Greece played a decisive role in introducing a renewed socio-political understanding to art practice in a country where formalism was enforced—more or less literally by leading male art historians—as the only acceptable way to approach and interpret art, and b) that Greek performance art, though undervalued and, for the most part, ignored in Greek art histories—for reasons discussed throughout the thesis—had a significant and solid presence throughout the five decades examined - though clearly more intense in terms of frequency after 2000. In undertaking this research, I had a number of key research questions:

- How did the military Junta of 1967–1974 contribute to the emergence and establishment of performance art in Greece?
- In what ways does cultural diversity affect the production and reception of performance (either by Greek artists presenting their work abroad or by artists of non-Greek origin living and working in Greece)?
- Does the site of performance art (institutional or other) determine its production and reception, and if so, in what ways?

¹ As I am going to explain later, performance was also explored within the field of experimental music in the late 1960s to the 1980s.
What prompted the intense re-emergence of performance art along with participatory post-performance practices in Greece in the late 1990s? Was it an outcome of broader socio-economic conditions, was it because of a new ‘social turn’ in Greece, or did it address the need to follow the current trends of a hegemonic Western art scene?

What are the links between feminism and performance art in Greece, and in what ways has the ideology of post-feminism affected the production of performance?

What are the links and discontinuities between performance art and post-performance practices?

Finally, can performance have a history without the document, and what is the role of the document in the dissemination of performance art and its establishment as a distinct genre?

The literature on performance art in Greece is scant, both within the borders and without. To my knowledge, this is the first study to attempt a historical contextualisation of the development of performance art in Greece from the 1970s to the 2010s and propose a critical and thematic approach through a coherent narrative. The dual aim has been, first, to facilitate the integration of performance art into a national art history and, second, to contribute to an expansion of performance art histories in an international context through the presentation of hitherto unknown material. Conducting this study has required large-scale, in situ research and overcoming the major obstacle of the absence of publicly held archives—one reason why even an elementary linear history of performance art has been so difficult (indeed, impossible) to achieve. A second reason has been the overall marginalisation of performance art theory in the Greek context. To be precise, the notable absence of bibliographical references on the subject intrigued me to the point of undertaking this research. In 2009, during my first attempt to look into Greek artists that engaged with performance, I could not locate any book on the Greek scene. The only book-length study to focus exclusively on performance art was Εικαστικές Δράσεις [Visual Art Actions, 2006] by Danae Chondrou which provided an overview and categorisation of performance in the Western art world with only a small chapter on Greek performance. Consistent with most art historical output in Greek, Chondrou’s approach is more descriptive than theoretical, virtually reiterating a normative performance art narrative for Greek readers who would be unable to access international literature. Upon completion of my research, Chondrou’s book remains the sole Greek-language attempt to approach performance art, even if not focusing on developments in Greece. The shocking lack of Greek bibliography related to performance art raised the first
questions for shaping the present research. Why was this genre so neglected in Greek histories of art? Was it because it was not worth writing about, or because most art historians and researchers in Greece have avoided discussing the artistic practices of the last decades because they were generally more attached to the art of the antiquity rather than contemporary art? Or, could it also be that performance art was undervalued and not been seen as ‘high art’?

To collect preliminary information, I turned to exhibition catalogues that included performative works and could at least offer descriptions or some documentation of performance pieces. A few of them were quite helpful as they provide a framework for the new tendencies that appeared in Greek contemporary art in the 1970s. The exhibition Περιβάλλον-Δράση: Τάσεις της Ελληνικής Τέχνης Σήμερα [Environment-Action: Tendencies of Greek Art Today, 1981] set the focus, probably for the first time in Greece, exclusively on environments and performative works by thirteen artists. The texts included in the catalogue offer descriptions and in some cases interpretations of the artworks without developing any theoretical framework though. Other than in exhibition catalogues, some references to Greek performance art can be found in literature on Greek contemporary art. Art historian Eleni Vakalo in Η Φυσιογνωμία της Ελληνικής Τέχνης στην Ελλάδα - Μετά την Αφαίρεση [The Physiognomy of Post-War Art in Greece - After Abstraction, 1985] includes a small chapter titled ‘Action and Happenings’ where she briefly discusses about the genres of happenings, body art and performance art, and makes some references to Greek artists (such as to Theodoros (Papadimitriou), Dimitris Alithinos, Titsa Grekou–Nikos Zouboulis and Leda Papaconstantinou) that have engaged in such practices without, however, proceeding to a deeper analysis of their work. Art historian Areti Adamopoulou in her book Ελληνική Μεταπολεμική Τέχνη: Εικαστικές Παρεμβάσεις στο Χώρο [Post-War Greek Art: Artistic Interventions in Space, 2000] presents a substantial selection of artistic interventions with special focus on sculpture and installation between 1960 and 1990. Although she mentions some of the first performative works to have taken place in Greece, she does not develop any

---

2 Bia Papadopoulou (ed.). 2006. *The Years of Defiance. The Art of the ’70s in Greece* (National Museum of Contemporary Art, Hellenic Ministry of Culture) and Thanasis Moutsopoulos (ed.). 2006. *Great Unrest, 5 Utopias in the 70s, a Bit Before - a Bit After* (Patra European Capital of Culture) have been of great help at the outset of my research. Giorgos Tzirizilakis (ed.).1999. Π+Π=Δ. Νέα Τέχνη από τις Δεκαετίες του ’70 και του ’80. Επιλογές από τον ‘Δεσμό’ [P+P=D. New Art from the 1970s and 1980s. A Selection from Desmos Gallery] (Futura) and Alexandros Xydis (ed.). 1981. Περιβάλλον-Δράση: Τάσεις της Ελληνικής Τέχνης Σήμερα [Environment-Performance: Tendencies of Greek Art Nowadays] (Greek Art Critics Association) have also been some of the first sources I have used at the beginning of my research.
specific arguments concerning the rise and trajectory of performance practice in the country. Her references are mainly descriptive, and as she explains in the book’s introduction, her intention is not to examine in depth performative practices such as happenings or performances. Some issues regarding performance art are also discussed in the significant monograph Σώμα: Ικεσία και Απειλή [Body: Plea and Threat, 2003] by art historian Pepi Rigopoulou. The author examines the body in visual art, cinema and theatre during the twentieth century, drawing on cultural theory, psychoanalysis, anthropology and feminist theory. Although Rigopoulou refers to a very limited number of performances by Greek artists, her text is perhaps the first and one of few attempts in Greek language to place performance art within a theoretical framework. One of the most consistent attempts of specifically theorising Greek performance has been made in 7 Performances and a Conversation (2006), a catalogue edited by Maria-Thalia Carras and Sophia Tournikiotis, which presents seven performances by different young artists and includes theoretical essays that make important contributions to the literature on Greek performance art. Even a cursory glance at the Greek art literature suggests that Leda Papaconstantinou, active since the late 1960s, has been the most visible artist to have prioritised performance in her work: most references regarding performance art in Greece relate to her oeuvre, included in numerous exhibition catalogues and articles. A publication on her performative work, written by Papaconstantinou herself, lists descriptions of her best-known performances without, however, any in-depth analysis or theorisation of the listed works. In 2013, Angela Dimitrakaki published in Greek Τέχνη και Παγκοσμιοποίηση: Από το Μεταμοντέρνο Σημείο στη Βιοπολιτική Αρένα [Art and Globalisation: From the Postmodern Sign to the Biopolitical Arena], a theoretical study connecting the spread of post- and anti-visual, performative artistic practices since 1989 to wider socio-economic developments. The book makes a significant and imperative addition to the Greek bibliography regarding globalisation’s impact on art internationally (in terms of practices and institutions) but includes discussion of just one art project of relevance to the development of Greek performance art (which I decided to include and elaborate on in my thesis). Another important contribution to the field has been Performance Now v.1: Επιτελεστικές Πρακτικές στην Τέχνη και Δράσεις in Situ [Performance Now v.1: Performative Practices in Art and Actions in Situ, 2014], which includes seven essays approaching performance art from diverse perspectives. Yet only three of the essays refer to the work of Greek artists. In 2015, AICA Hellas published a collection

---

3 The catalogue includes texts by Yiorgos Tzirtzilakis, Avgoustinos Zenakos, Leda Papaconstantinou, Apostolia Papadamaki, Marili Mastrantoni and Nikos Kazeros.
of five essays and an interview under the title *Maria Karavela* shedding light on the—for many years unacknowledged—work of Maria Karavela, one of the first Greek artists to engage with performance in Greece. The most recent publication that includes works of Greek performance artists is Areti Leopoulou’s *Ευεργετικά Παράσιτα: Προσεγγίσεις του Καθημερινού από τους Λήδα Παπακωνσταντίνου/ Αλεξάνδρα Κατσιάνη και Θανάση Χονδρό/ Γιώργο Τσακίρη* [Beneficial Parasites: Approaching the Everyday through the Work of Leda Papaconstantinou/Alexandra Katsiani and Thanasis Chondros/Giorgos Tsakiris, 2017]. Although Leopoulou presents at length, for the first time, a great part of Alexandra Katsiani and Thanassis Chondros’ work and one performance by Leda Papaconstantinou, her approach gives prominence to the theme of ‘everyday life’ rather than to a broader socio-political contextualisation of performance art. Finally, art historian Irene Gerogianni has recently submitted her PhD thesis *Η Περφόρμανς στην Ελλάδα από τις Αρχές της Δεκαετίας του ’70* [Performance Art in Greece since the Beginning of the 1970s] at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. This research, however, is focused on performance art in the 1970s, with a limited number of examples drawn from up to 1986.

For the purposes of this study, the notion of performance as live art has been expanded to include not only live performances realised either before an art audience or an unsuspecting public, but also performative environments, private one-to-one performances, participatory and post-performance practices or projects that have sometimes taken the form of installations and performatively constructed photographs operating as performances in their own right. Even though artists and theorists have coined diverse terms to illustrate performative practices (happenings, fluxus, actions, rituals, demonstrations, direct art, destruction art, event art, and body art, among others), I will subsume the different forms of live art examined in this thesis into the category of performance art since live actions are hard to circumscribe with limited definitions and the limits—if there are any—are usually quite fluid and rather indefinable. I do not intend, therefore, to draw strict boundaries around different performative practices, but to explore the diverse realisations of performance as part of contemporary Greek art through a broad range of case studies addressed in five chapters.

---

4 According to the Live Art Development Agency (LADA) ‘To talk about Live Art is to talk about art that invests in ideas of process, presence and experience as much as the production of objects or things; art that wants to test the limits of the possible and the permissible; and art that seeks to be alert and responsive to its contexts, sites and audiences’. See LADA’s Website, [http://www.thisisliveart.co.uk/about/what-is-live-art/](http://www.thisisliveart.co.uk/about/what-is-live-art/) [accessed 6/6/2017].

5 For a further explanation on each of these terms see Kristine Stiles. 1996. ‘Performance Art’ in *Theories and Documents of Contemporary Art: A Sourcebook of Artists’ Writings*, 679-694.
The selected body of material is organised by a thematic and not a chronological approach. Following this introduction, Part I of the thesis, comprising three chapters, examines for the first time in Greek art history the politics of Greek performance art through the analysis of three different subjects: 1) political struggles, resistance and protest, 2) public space and 3) gender. Part II engaged an expanded notion of performance art by examining 4) post-performance practices related to community-based art and 5) the role of the document as both a medium and mediator of information but also as an experience. It should be noted that the specific categories—protest, gender, public space, community-based art and process and documentation—emerged from the research instead of being applied to it. After having collected a great part of the material pertaining to works spanning from the 1970s until the 2010s, I grouped the performances in a way that formed a consistent structure for their presentation and discussion so as to both identify the main tendencies of Greek performance art and map the diversity of performative practices. These themes are well-established issues in international literature and are often used to examine performance art in the West but also in the histories of Eastern Europe. This common ground relates to two important issues: first, artists working in Greece are actually part of and should be included in the European tradition of experimental and avant-garde practices; and, second, there is a dearth of both historical and theoretical study of contemporary Greek art, even with regard to the most mainstream issues. At the same time, more recently deployed concepts in art history and theory —such as to biopolitics, artistic labour, immaterial labour, post-Fordist ways of art production—along with themes and issues that underscore some particularities of the Greek case (such as that it emerged under conditions of censorship) are incorporated in the analysis so as to shed light not only on the similarities and connections, but also the disconnections of performance in Greece in relation to the West.

The thesis does not present all the material I encountered in the course of my research. What I have included here is based on certain criteria. First of all, I opted to focus on artworks rather than on artists—works by the same artist can be discussed in the same or different chapters depending on the concepts and frameworks they relate to. The examination of diverse concepts and contexts of performativity has been one of the primary criteria for the selection of the artworks. The works’ relationship to the socio-political and/or socio-economic framework out of which they emerged and within which they are presented, documented and circulated or archived was another criterion. When writing the research proposal, I intended to include only Greek artists, meaning artists who worked in Greece and had been raised
there. A great many artists and academics that leave Greece to study or gain work experience do not return. Labour mobility has been a common characteristic of the periphery where artists often migrate to more central spaces because of greater opportunities in art studies, venues to present their work, art-residencies, funding opportunities and so on. In recent years, the situation has been far more complicated since many art professionals live and work in more than one country. There are also artists from other countries who live, work and perform in Greece and works by some of them are discussed in the thesis. Additionally, I decided not to include work by artists who left Greece and never returned or only visited occasionally to exhibit—Lukas Samaras, Stelarc [born in Cyprus as Stelios Arcadiou], Jannis Kounellis, Maria Klonaris and Katerina Thomadaki are some examples. The reader will most likely have come across these names before but not most of the names included in the thesis: being an ‘international artist’ has dependent on an artist’s willingness and/or opportunity to migrate.

The research methods include a critical overview of the literature on the subject, archival research and interviews with artists, art historians and curators. Attending performance festivals, biennales, exhibitions, seminars and conferences was also integral to this research. My methodology relates to a social history of art, and the performances I examine are considered in relation to the socio-political and, in some cases, economic contexts from which they emerged. The fact that Greek artists have used specifically performance as a critical response to social and political issues has made this imperative—while it might indicate a reason why the study of performance has been practically suppressed in a formalism-dominated Greek art history. This however is a difficult relationship to untangle: did excluding performance art from the history of Greek art happen because of the complete hegemony of formalism, or, was the exclusion of performance a crucial factor in formalism protracting its hegemony in Greek art history? The question must be left unanswered for now, though I do return to the issue of performance art’s marginalisation elsewhere in the thesis. My analysis draws on visual culture, social, political and feminist theory. Writings not only on performance and body art, but also on relational and dialogical aesthetics, participatory and community-based art were consulted. Since the international literature on performative artistic practices is vast (unlike in Greece as already explained) the study builds on texts by Amelia Jones, RoseLee Goldberg, Peggy Phelan, Miwon Kwon, Phillip Auslander, Grant Kester, Claire Bishop, Boris Groys, Angela Dimitrakaki and Bojana Kunst
among others. The theoretical framework is further clarified in the chapter outlines in the fourth part of this introduction.

In her seminal book *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*, Peggy Phelan stresses that writing about performance art can be challenging since the object of study disappears.\(^6\) The ephemerality of performance art by default creates a disadvantage for the researcher. The difficulty of researching performance art is intensified when there is an evident lack of proper infrastructure such as publicly held archives. The Institute of Contemporary Greek Art (ISET), founded in Athens in 2009, has made a significant contribution to the study of contemporary art and been helpful at some points of my research. Yet their material on performance is limited and hard to locate since the search engine does not respond to art genres/keywords but artists’ names, dates and publications.\(^7\) The same applies to the archive of the National Museum of Contemporary Art. The only other way to collect data was through artists’ private archives and through interviews. During the course of my research, I conducted twenty-six interviews with artists, art historians and curators. Specifically, I interviewed (orally and/or in writing) the artists Mary Zygouri, Evangelia Basdekis, Georgia Sagri, Fani Sofologi, Leda Papakonstantinou, Dimitris Alithinos, Theodoros Papadimitriou, Marios Spiliopoulos, Thanassis Chondros and Alexandra Katsiani, Yiannis Gigas and Giorgos Nouvakis, Alexandros Plomaritis, Rosina Ivanova, Marios Spyroglou, Angeliki Avgitidou, Marios Chatziprokopiou, Myrto Tsimimpoundi and Ally Walsh, Jennifer Nelson, Fotini Kalle, Maria Paschalidou, Nikos Tranos (member of art group Savra [Lizard]) and the art historians Pepi Rigopoulou, Lia Yoka and Christiana Galanopoulou. It would be a herculean task to provide an appendix with the interviews since the duration of each exceeds three hours, in most cases. Consequently, the written transcripts would far exceed the word limitations of a PhD thesis. The interviews, apart from two, were all conducted in Greek and could be examined at any time by my supervisor who is a native Greek speaker. In some cases, I have had further communication with interviewees via email and telephone.

---


\(^7\) ISET which is a non-profit organisation received all the archival material from Desmos Gallery. Desmos, established in 1971 (that is during the Greek dictatorship) by Manos Pavlidis and Eppie Protonotariou was not a conventional commercial art gallery but rather a contemporary art centre that exhibited the work of artists who experimented with various artistic mediums and organised several events, lectures and discussions for the support and promotion of contemporary Greek art. It was one of the first galleries in Greece that showcased conceptual works, installations and performances. For further information on ISET see [http://www.iset.gr/en](http://www.iset.gr/en) [accessed 29/3/2016]. About Desmos Gallery see Matoula Skaltsa (ed.). 1989. *Αίθουσες Τέχνης στην Ελλάδα: Αθήνα – Θεσσαλονίκη 1920-1988* [Art Spaces in Greece: Athens - Thessaloniki 1920-1988] (Apopsi), 84-86.
Most of the interviews assumed the form of long discussions during which I watched photographic and video documentation of the performances. My questions related to the artists’ and curators’ intentions, audience’s reactions, possible complications during the performative process and conditions of being a performance artist in Greece. We also discussed the conditions of contemporary art during the years of their performative work and the acceptance or rejection of their work by the art institutions and the press. The process of interviewing artists and accessing their personal archives was invaluable to this research; without access to their documents and narratives it would have been impossible to realise this study.

Finally, it should be noted that my research was conducted at a time of unprecedented social and economic turmoil, a condition which in some ways affected the process and development of the investigation. A great number of artists and institutions became suddenly and intensely preoccupied with performance art; especially after 2010 (the inaugural year of Greece’s ‘crisis’ when the International Monetary Fund took over), performance art could be encountered almost anywhere at any time: in the street, in the museum, during political protests, in bars, in libraries, etc. Such a fact indicated a resurgence of performance art taking place under similarly disturbing, frightening and depressing political and socio-economic conditions as those under which it had emerged in the first place. The political, social and economic conditions gave artists a sense of urgency and situated their production of performance art within renewed conditions identified as a dictatorship—this time economic rather than military. Less positively for this study, the precipitous deterioration of finances (the country’s and, in the context, my own) during these years impeded the research in several instances, especially where frequent travelling was required.

2. The Field of Performance Art: Within and Outside the Greek Borders

*L’impossible, un homme dans l’espace* [The Impossible: A Man in Space] is probably the ‘first performance’ by a Greek artist. Takis (born Panayotis Vassilakis) presented it in 1960 at the Iris Clert Gallery in Paris. Takis, born in 1925, in Athens is a Greek self-taught sculptor and inventor who moved in mid 1950s in Paris. Time, space and energy have been primary materials for Takis. The artist, who describes himself as an ‘instinctive scientist’, employs powerful, elemental forces to generate the forms, movements, and musical sounds of both his static and kinetic works. He has exhibited his work worldwide while many of his sculptures can be found in many public locations in and around Paris. Takis is best known for *The Signal Sculptures (Les
during the performance, read from his magnetic manifesto: ‘I am a sculpture, you can buy me, I am Takis’s artwork... I would like to see all nuclear bombs on Earth turned into sculptures’. The poet then leapt into the air and was momentarily suspended by a magnetic field created by a magnetised belt Takis had designed. Five months later (April 1961) the Soviets put Yuri Gagarin in space, and the next year John Glenn became the first US astronaut in space. It is perhaps interesting to also note that in 1959, Yves Klein was involved in ‘a peculiar artistic “space race”’ with Takis. The two artists had been intensely competing to claim their association with the invention of floating sculpture.


That Takis presented the performance in Paris, where he also lived, indicates that although non-traditional media and practices in Greece had slowly started to have a more powerful presence in the late 1950s and 1960s, audiences were not yet ready to accept such radical forms of art; this is one of the reasons many Greek artists chose to live and work abroad. The 1950s had been a transitional period for Greece. The hard years of the German occupation (1941-1944) and the following Civil War (1946-1949) had exhausted Greek society, which was now trying to find a new orientation towards Europe. It is important to note that after the Churchill-Stalin ‘percentage agreement’ (1944) Greece, unlike other Balkan countries, came under the influence of the UK at 90%. It was therefore ensured that Greece would not be part of


of the communist block. The ‘spheres of influence’ after the WWII agreement dictated the country’s relationship to Europe.\footnote{See P.M.H. Bell and Mark Gilbert, 2016. \textit{The World since 1945: An International History} (Bloomsbury).} Although the political situation was not stable yet, the economy was reorganising around free market, and a general growth based on capitalism was taking place.

In the visual arts, a wider audience started showing interest while international exhibitions were organised. In parallel, many artists and critics travelled abroad to study and work. The field of art was also enriched with new exhibition venues and art magazines, such as \textit{Ζωγράφος} [Yoke, 1955] and \textit{Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης} [Art Review, 1954–1967].\footnote{The major breakthrough in Greek post war art is considered to be the movement of abstraction. Although some artists had made efforts to approach abstraction before, it was only after 1955 that a true interest in denying the form of visible reality was manifested on behalf of Greek painters (such as Alekos Kontopoulos and Yannis Spiropoulos) and a distancing from representation started gaining ground. This turn to abstraction could be connected to the new abstract art tendencies which appeared the same period in Europe and the US such as Art Informel, Abstract Expressionism, etc. Abstraction was considered in Greece the avant-garde that changed the form of Greek art, yet its reception was again characterised by disbelief and hostility, mainly by the most conservative art cycles who considered it as a form of expression alienated from the Greek idiosyncrasy and way of living. 1960, the year that Spiropoulos won the UNESCO price in the Venice Biennale, is considered to be the milestone for the acceptance of abstraction by the Greek art world and audience. See Eleni Vakalo. 1983. \textit{Η Φωτογραφική της Ελληνικής Τέχνης στην Ελλάδα - Ο Μέθοδος της Ελληνικότητας} [The Physiognomy of Post-War Art in Greece – The Myth of Greekness] (Kedros). Alexandros Xydis. 1976. \textit{Προτάσεις για την Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Τέχνης Α’: Διαμόρφωση-Εξέλιξη} [Propositions for the History of Contemporary Greek Art Volume 1: Formation-Development] (Athens, Olkos).} Moreover, beginning in the early 1950s (until 1967), Group A’, an initiative founded by artists with left-wing sympathies in Athens, brought the visual arts closer to the general public and working-class people. Such an initiative was extremely hard to implement because of the particular political conditions and tension that followed the Greek Civil War; for the formation of any such group, special permission had to be given by the police. The Association of Greek Women Artists was also founded in 1954, allowing women artists to claim professional status; this counteracted the common ironic comments in the press which attributed women’s artistic work to amateurism, and also identified women’s work as one of the main obstacles to the ‘progress’ of modern Greek art.\footnote{Group A’ held public meetings and lectures, published their views on political events and organised the first national conference on the visual arts in 1965. See Angela Dimitrakaki. 2000. \textit{Gender, Geographies, Representation: Women, Painting and the Body in Britain and Greece, 1970-1990}, Unpublished PhD Thesis (University of Reading), 36-37. See also Yannis Hainis. 2002. ‘Ομάδα Τέχνης Α’ [Art Group A] in Urania Kaiafi, 1949-1967. \textit{Η Εκρηκτική Εκπαιδευτική} [1949-1967. The Explosive Twenty Years] (Athens, Etaireia Spouden Neolitenikou Politismou kai Pedias), 349-362. Evgenios Matthiopoulos. 1999. ‘Από τον “Σύλλογο των Πρώτων Τέχνων” στους “Νέους Έλληνες Ρεαλιστές”: Καλλιτεχνικές Ομάδες και Οργανώσεις στην Ελλάδα (1882-1974)’ [From the ‘Union of Fine Arts’ to ‘New Greek Realists’: Art Groups and Unions in Greece (1882-1974) in Marina Labraki Plaka (ed.), \textit{Εθνική Πανακόσμιος Χρόνια, Τέσσερις Αιώνες Ελληνικής Ζωγραφικής} [National Gallery 100 Years, Four Centuries of Greek Painting] (Athens, National Gallery and Alexandros Soutsos Museum), 169.} Moreover, it was in 1958 that the artist Leonidas Christakis organised, probably for the first time in Greece, a sort of ‘happening’ in which he invited
several artists to make kites that they later flew on Ash Monday. It was also in 1958 that Allan Kaprow published his essay ‘The Legacy of Jackson Pollock’, where he coined the term ‘happening’ to suggest as art ‘something’ that happens spontaneously. Happenings signalled a moving away from autonomous art objects and turning to live events that incorporated painting, installation, music, as well as everyday activities; they declare in a way that craftsmanship and permanence should be replaced with perishable art. The next year Kaprow presented 18 Happenings in 6 Parts at the Reuben Gallery in New York; it was probably the first time a wider audience experienced this sort of event. It was in the 1950s that the earliest performative activities were also witnessed in Eastern Europe, in parallel to those in Western Europe and the US. Although happenings started as scripted events, in which the audience and performers followed directions and signals to participate in the action and experience art, in the 1960s a happening became more of ‘a game, an adventure, a number of activities engaged in by participants for the sake of playing’. This concept of art as a game and participation as playing was more ‘presented’ in Greece rather than adopted or embraced, which only occurred a decade later. In 1975, Pavlos, a Greek artist living in Paris, flirted with viewer participation and the idea of the game in an action-event at the Iolas-Zoumboulakis Gallery in Athens. The artist placed sacks of confetti in the gallery and invited the viewers to throw them at the walls on which he had sketched an almost invisible composition with brush and glue. The ‘invisible’ picture, which was rendered visible after the visitors’ contribution, depicted freeze-frame sports scenes.

---

14 Danai Chondrou mentions the specific happening in Chondrou. 2006. Εικαστικές Δράσεις [Visual Actions] (Apopeira), 95.
The 1960s and its wave of consumerism created a more fertile ground in Greece for art experimentations and innovative ideas. The art scene experienced an unprecedented flourishing; galleries and exhibitions proliferated and new visual arts magazines were launched. Additionally, the number of art historians and critics increased and the art market started to expand. For the first time, artists were not pursuing the idea of ‘Greekness’ [Ελληνικότητα] in their work, but were trying to escape it.19 The concept of Greekness in art had its origins in the 1920s, when the catastrophe of Asia Minor (1922), which followed the Balkan Wars (1912–1913) and WWI, destroyed ‘Megali Idea’ (Great Idea), the Greek nationalist goal of establishing a state encompassing all Greek-inhabited areas and all the regions that belonged to Greeks in ancient times.20 The defeat of this concept generated the need for national self-assurance, and this was expressed through aversion to the West and a return to tradition. The Metaxas dictatorship that followed (1936–40) imitated the examples of German Nazism and Italian fascism and used art to promote ideologies among the masses. The dictatorship conveniently took advantage of the idea of Greekness and the return to tradition and used them in favour of the nationalistic ideology of the regime. The so-called ‘1930s Generation [Γενιά του ’30] of artists tried to activate a dialogue between Greek

tradition and international modern art using the concept of Greekness. Interested in a creative patriotism centred not in ancient Greek art, but in the particularities of Greekness, artists were trying to attribute Greek identity to their art. Greek folk art, naïve painters and the Byzantine tradition were therefore rediscovered. Generally, the tension between modernism and tradition manifested in a dilemma that dictated the course of Greek art for many years; at the same time, these were the two main features of an idiomorphic Greek modernism. It should also be noted that there is no evidence of a Greek avant-garde with strong performative elements like Futurism in Italy and Dada in Switzerland. Surrealism, though, was notably manifest in Greek poetry and painting.

To return to the 1960s and 1970s, a great number of art groups of varying longevity and aims were founded during these two significant decades: the New Greek Realists, Visual Arts Centre (KET), Group for Communication and Education in Art, Processes–Systems, the Group of Six Artists, Art Group 4+, Artists’ Association and several others. Among the aims of most of the above groups was to promote visual art and art education, through public lectures and discussions, to the general public outside the museum or gallery. It was in the 1960s that some artists in Greece started to reject object-based art and explore performative practices through the abolishment of boundaries between the arts; they drew connections between avant-garde music and bodily action. In the early 1960s, the visual artist Grigoris Semitekolo reportedly made processions in Exarchia (Athens) towards Patission Street, convincing passers-by to follow him (there is no documentation confirming this act, though); he was one of the first Greek artists to engage with performative practices. His approach, however, did not occur within a visual arts context, but in connection with experimental music. In late 1960s and during the 1970s, Semitekolo collaborated several times with composer Jani Christou performing the latter’s *The Pianist*, in Greece but also in Europe and the US As Maria Maragou notes, the artist functioning as the pianist ‘broke several times his phonetic cords screaming imperishably, invoking archetypical forces to convince the piano to accept him and bleeding while caressing, threatening, pleading the shiny black mass and the


white keys having complete knowledge of the indiscernible terror that is on the verge of panic’.

Figures 0.4–0.6: Grigoris Semitekolo, Jani Christou, *Representation III: The Pianist*, 1969, Hellenic America Union, Athens.

Christou was well known and organised experimental music performances as events-happenings. In 1968, he presented *Επίκυκλος* [Epicycle] as a happening in the Hilton Hotel during the 3rd Greek Week of Contemporary Music. Before the event, the artist had invited the viewers, through the press, not only to attend but also to participate in the event by producing their own repeated sounds. In addition to Semitekolo, the artists Stathis Logothetis, Nikos Zoumboulis and Titsa Grekou also collaborated during the 1970s and 1980s with composers such as Theodoros Antoniou, Günther Becker, Anestis Logothetis and Jani Christou; then in the 1980s, the duo Thanassis Chondros and Alexandra Katsiani introduced an example of performance practice that sought to break the barriers between the visual arts and music.


26 Anestis Logothetis left Greece in 1942 and spend most his life in Vienna where he became influenced by modern composers such as John Cage, Earle Brown and Bruno Maderna. He also met with Otto Muehl and Hermann Nitsch and participated in their action *Perineigasse*. See Evgenia Alexaki. 2012. ‘Εικόνα-Ηχος-
In Western art, the intrusion of the event-happening into the field of experimental music had been the case at least since 1952, when John Cage composed perhaps his best-known and most controversial creation: *4’33”*. Performer Laurie Anderson has also been a prominent figure in work that combined experimental music, language, technology and visual imagery—practices were flourishing in the US during the 1970s.²⁷

It becomes evident already that it would be difficult to define performance art in a way that would reflect all its facets and forms of expression, since the term has been used to describe an extremely broad range of performative acts. RoseLee Goldberg has described performance art as an extremely open-ended and anarchic medium which ‘defies precise or easy definition beyond the simple declaration that it is live art by artists’.²⁸ Yet, the website of the Irish Museum of Modern Art offers a more detailed definition:

Performance art is a form of arts practice that involves a person or persons undertaking an action or actions within a particular timeframe in a particular space or location for an audience. Central to the process and execution of performance art is the live presence of the artist and the real actions of his/her body, to create and present an ephemeral art experience to an audience. A defining characteristic of performance art is the body,

---

²⁷ See Goldberg, Roselee. 2004 [1998]. *Performance: Live Art since the 60s* (Thames and Hudson).
considered the primary medium and conceptual material on which performance art is based. Other key components are time, space and the relationship between performer and audience.²⁹

The above definition is precise enough and sets the focus on the live presence of artist and audience. Should we, however, consider the indissoluble connection formed through the years between performance art and its documentation (including the development of performative photography), the element of liveness and the requirement of an audience can be disputed since performances can be both live and mediated.³⁰ Moreover, a performance can now be watched at the time of its realisation by a great number of people all over the world through live streaming. Possibly, then, the most accurate—and concise—definition of performance art was given in 1970 by Willoughby Sharp, co-founder and co-editor of Avalanche Magazine; he noted that ‘body art’ is that art in which the body is both the subject and object of the artwork.³¹ This body, however, must not always and necessarily be the artist’s; it can also be the viewer’s.

In most histories of contemporary art, the first recorded traces of performance art are in the performative practices of Futurists, Dadaists and Surrealists. Performance is then linked to the happenings and Fluxus events of the late 1950s and 1960s; these eventually led to the performance and body art of the 1970s and the more theatrical performance of the 1980s.³² All the above genres share characteristics with performance art—such as the wish to merge art and life—so as to disassociate art from the materiality of the object and reject the traditional means of art production. The origins of performativity, though, can also be traced to the controversial figure of Jackson Pollock and the photographs of Hans Namuth which depict Pollock making his so-called ‘action paintings’; this shifted painting from art object to

³⁰ Already in 1960 Yves Klein created a photo montage of himself leaping from a wall over a quiet Paris street. The black and white photo, called Leap into the Void was and at the same time was not a performance. Phillip Auslander in his article ‘The Performativity of Performance Documentation’ classifies such documentation as theatrical while he also discusses the documentary documentation as a category which represents the traditional way in which the relationship between performance art and its documentation is conceived. A further analysis of the performativity of the document will take place in Chapter 5. See Phillip Auslander. 2006. ‘The Performativity of Performance Documentation’, *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*, 28/3: 1–10.
³² Roselee Goldberg in *Performance Art: From Futurism to the Present* (1979) offered a detailed analysis of the genealogy of performance art in which she also included the Russian constructivists and Bauhaus performances. See also Lea Vergine. 2000. *Body Art and Performance, The Body as Language* (Skira Editore).
art process and action. On the other hand, some art historians have turned to Minimalism to consider its influence on art prioritising audience interaction and theatricality. The phenomenological relation of spectator and artwork that minimalist art prompted was further explored by performance art.

Although performance art’s origins may be traced within modernism, the performance art of the 1960s and 1970s is also intertwined with the rise of postmodernism and second-wave feminism. The subversion of a stable and fixed meaning, deriving solely from the structure of the artwork, promised by performance art placed the latter within postmodernism in the writings of many art historians. Leading performance art historian Amelia Jones has argued that ‘the poststructuralist and feminist discussion of the destabilisation of the subject in postmodernism, the contingency of the self on the other, the interconnectedness of body/self, and the materiality of the body as subject can be seen as describing a set of conditions that both explain (retroactively) and motivate (precede) the effects of body art’. Although Jones distinguishes performance and body art, her statement is applicable to most performative practices that aspire to create an intersubjective space where production and meaning are not predefined but rather experienced as a process of fermentation.

Feminist artists in both the West and East often used performance art to address issues of gender inequality and women’s oppression; Carolee Schneemann, Mary Kelly, Martha Rosler, Bob Baker, Karen Finley, Jo Spence, the Guerrilla Girls, Tanja Ostojić and the less

---

34 Michael Fried’s well known article ‘Art and Objecthood’ (1967), an analysis of minimalist art to which he refers to as ‘literalist’ art, strives to demote minimalist practice by exploring the intricate phenomenological relation of viewer and art work. Whilst art objects are composed with an internal coherence and therefore seem autonomous from the surrounding world in contradiction to subjects in minimalist art the objects formulate situations that produce a relation of theatricality vis-à-vis the spectator. As Fried himself notes minimalist sensibility is ‘theatrical because to begin with, it is concerned with the actual circumstances in which the beholder encounters the literalist work… [T]he experience of literalist art is of an object in a situation – one that, virtually by definition, includes the beholder’. Michael Fried. 1998. ‘Art and Objecthood’ in Art and Objecthood: Essays and Reviews (University Of Chicago Press), 153.
known in the heavily western-biased international canon but still important Sanja Iveković and Katalin Ladik are just few examples among many. In terms of feminist discourse, performance has been both praised and criticised. A number of feminists’ negative stance towards performance (and in particular, body art) has been based on the idea that any representation or presentation of the female body would amplify the objectification and fetishisation of women. The widespread presence of the female body (often nude) in performances of the 1970s was often related to, or identified with, essentialist notions of gender identity and femininity.\textsuperscript{37} Marsha Meskimmon suggests that at times transgressive performances, such as Annie Sprinkle’s, have become dangerously close to the very objectifications they have sought to dismantle.\textsuperscript{38} Counter to this, however, other art theorists contended that such projections of the female body rendered women visible as creative subjects instead of inspiration objects and challenged traditional representations of the female body and gender roles.\textsuperscript{39}

In the histories of contemporary Greek art, performance art has been almost completely disassociated from feminist readings, with the only exception being the work of Leda Papaconstantinou, the most prominent and consistent advocate of performance art since the late 1960s.\textsuperscript{40} Chapter 3 shows that though a number of Greek women artists used performance to address the politics of gender, Greek art historians, with very few exceptions, have always deflected attention to other issues, avoiding or indeed suppressing the feminist messages.

Performance art developed in several forms, some of which had a more internal and introverted character, while others were more theatrical or participatory. In addition to feminist politics, anti-war protest (especially against the cruelty of the Vietnam War) and the political and social upheavals of the 1960s played crucial roles in the ascendance of performance. Activist performances drew attention to socio-political issues, while other artists, such as the Yugoslavia-born Marina Abramović, explored the potentialities and limits of the human body when exposed to pain, loss of control and transformation. The body was used as a subversive artistic medium, an instrument of resistance against the domination of capital and the commodification of art. Performance’s ephemerality, conceptuality and alleged immateriality rejected traditional media and offered the dematerialisation of the art object. The absence of a tangible object or output in performance generated hopes of undermining the authority of the art market and art as commodity. Such hopes proved unsustainable, and performance art was eventually incorporated into art institutions and the market.

Site is a defining factor of performance art. Since their emergence, performances took place in both institutional and alternative art spaces. Public and semi-public spaces such as streets, squares, cafes or bars have also become sites of performance art. As a consequence, performance art has had a great range of audiences. One of the most significant elements of performative artworks is that site and audience do not constitute external conditions of performance but often become an integral part of the artwork’s process and meaning. This argument is further examined in Chapters 1, 2 and 4.

It is also important to note that artists in the East have not questioned the function of the art object as artists have in the West; instead, they created works that related to local issues within the context of the late or post-Communist era. As art historian Amy Bryzgel notes, artists in the East, who operated within a wholly disparate set of social and political circumstances, ‘utilised performance art to reclaim both public space and the body from the control of the state, and engage with issues that they would not be able to address in their

---

41 Performances can range from a series of small-scale intimate gestures to public rallies and spectacles presented in solo or collaborative form.
paintings, and which would be considered taboo in official contexts’. In the countries with the lowest level of individual freedom (such as Romania, Bulgaria and Russia), artists often staged their performances in private apartments since this kind of activity was prohibited in public spaces. The well known Collective Action Group realised most of their performances only for restricted audiences. On the other hand, artists in the former Yugoslavia, for instance, were not that isolated and had more opportunities for collaboration with the international scene. In the 1960s and 1970s, ‘local issues’ preoccupied artists in Greece as well: performance was used as a form of covert, harder to detect protest against the military regime. I explain this in greater detail in Chapter 1. Yet despite Greece being in the Balkans there was no exchange and interaction with neighbouring countries—not even with the less isolated ones such as Yugoslavia. This was an outcome of the ‘spheres of influence’ post WWII agreement, where Greece was the only Balkan country given to West. In this ideology of extreme polarisation and boundaries, Greek artists travelled for studies or work in the dominant art centres of the West.

The cultural flourishing of 1960s Greece was abruptly interrupted by the military Junta of 21 April 1967 which lasted until 1974. Censorship, exile, imprisonment and torture stunted most forms of artistic activity during the first years—except, that is, activities supported by the colonels themselves. These involved propagandistic, massive open-air spectacles, usually of historical re-enactments (the ‘Festivals of the Polemic Virtue of the Greeks’, for example). Predictably, the colonels’ regime—whose values were summarily expressed in the infamous slogan ‘Fatherland, Religion, Family’—also favoured the return to traditional forms of representational art and demanded an unambiguous meaning in artworks. Many artists, as a result, decided to not make work as an act of protest while others opted to exile and leave the country during the Junta. However, despite or rather because of the oppression and censorship from the military regime, new forms of artistic action were activated, as argued in

---

46 See Gonda Van Steen. 2010. ‘Rallying the Nation: Sport and Spectacle Serving the Greek Dictatorships’, The International Journal of the History of Sport, 27/12: 2121-2154. In her article Gonda Van Steen addresses the dictators’ excessive acts of stage-managing a mass theatre of indoctrination through athletic events, military displays and historical re-enactments. She argues that Greek dictatorial regimes ‘allocated an important role to sport and bodily culture to shore up their nationalist “mission” and that, as a result, they militarised and politicised the field’ (p. 2121). See also Gonda Van Steen. 2014. Stage of Emergency: Theatre and Public Performance under the Greek Military Dictatorship of 1967-1974 (Oxford University Press).
Chapter 1. It is thus in this state of exception that performance art, at least within a visual arts framework, found fertile ground to emerge and engage audiences; performative environments at first and performative (in some cases participatory) practices later emerged as voices of resistance calling for communication and political change. It is at that point that Greek art made an explicit political turn and artists used the body as a tool: socio-political changes rather than adherence to an international trend dictated the specific approach.

Despite changes in the conditions of its articulation, themes and concerns, performance has been constantly present since the 1960s (though not always as popular as in the last decade or so). This is true not only for the dominant West, but also for Eastern Europe and Greece, despite the different conditions of actualisation. In the West, the 1980s saw a proliferation of relevant festivals and publications, along with an increase of institutional support, since performance was now funded by the arts council under the separate category of live art. Following Greece’s restoration of democracy in 1974, some formerly self-exiled artists and intellectuals returned to the country leading to more systematic efforts to endorse contemporary art and the art market to expand. At this time, the absence of a national museum of contemporary art became even more conspicuous. It was in the early 1980s that performance art was recognised as a genre of its own when the Association of Greek Art Critics’ exhibition Περιβάλλον-Δράση [Environment–Action] took place in Zappeion in 1981.47 Thus, while by the mid 1980s performance in the West had reached a peak of acceptance, in Greece it was just starting to be officially acknowledged by the art institutions.48 Also in 1981, Greece became the tenth member of the European Community, and its first socialist government (the Panhellenic Socialist Movement, PASOK) was elected.49 As will be explained in Chapter 1, the 1980s was a ‘formative’ if controversial decade, during which Greek society experienced a deep transformation. Although the 1980s has been identified with a period of abundance, since 2010 it is has been partly at least looked at in terms of the origin of the political and economic turmoil that eventually shook Greece in the 21st century. During the 1980s and the 1990s, a great number of diverse performative practices took place in Greece. These practices were very often realised in public spaces and had an interventionist character, as described in Chapter 2.

3. The Performative Turn

Art’s famous ‘social turn’ in the 1990s was at the same time a performative turn, which generated new subgenres of performance art and offered new ground for alternative approaches, both in practice and theory.50 Claire Bishop has used the term ‘delegated performance’ to describe artists’ tendency to hire non-professionals to perform an act rather than undertaking these events themselves, as used to be the case in the majority of performance art of the 1960s through ’80s. The works of Santiago Sierra and Tino Sehgal, for instance, are the most prominent examples of this tendency.51 In other cases, artists turn their own lives into a performance for long periods of time (or do they turn performance art into real life?). Tanja Ostojić’s *Looking for a Husband with EU Passport* (2000–2005) or Dani Marti’s *Bacon’s Dog* (2010) are exemplary of such performative practices.52 This merging of art and life has been pursued by artists since the historical avant-gardes. Yet, the new wave of practices since the 1990s hardly constitutes a realisation of the historical avant-garde’s revolutionary intentions. In *Looking for a Husband with EU Passport*, Tanja Ostojić posted a personal ad online accompanied by a photo of herself in order to find a husband from the affluent European Union. The artwork continued through the artist meeting (in a public performance) and marrying a German man (also an artist) and moving to Germany, where she was eventually denied permanent residence; the piece concluded five years later with a divorce. The work ‘stands as an acknowledgement of how exclusion from an assumed land of economic privilege can be constitutive of subjectivity’ and serves as ‘an emblematic exploration of the biopolitical arena as the context of both life and art—being performed as a nightmarish realisation of the historical avant-garde’s wish for the transformative fusion of

50 The term was coined by Claire Bishop in Bishop. 2006. ‘The Social Turn: Collaboration and Its Discontents’, *Artforum*: 44/6 (February): 178-183.
52 The only exhibition these works came together was *Economy* in 2013 taking place at the Centre for Contemporary Arts (CCA) in Glasgow and Stills Gallery in Edinburgh. The exhibition aimed to generate discussion on how economy affects all aspects of life addressing issues that ranged from migration, labour, sexuality and the crisis of democracy to the search for alternative futures. As the curators of the exhibition, Angela Dimitrakaki and Kirsten Lloyd, explain ‘as the core project, the exhibition ECONOMY tells different stories about how economy produces us, as individuals and communities, as we become productive in economic terms’. See [http://economyexhibition.stills.org/about/](http://economyexhibition.stills.org/about/) [accessed 12/12/2016]. For an analysis of Ostojić work see Angela Dimitrakaki. 2015. ‘Women’s Lives, Labour, Contracts, Documents: The Biopolitical Tactics of Feminist Art, Act Two and a Half’ in Angela Dimitrakaki and Kirsten Lloyd (eds.), *Economy: Art, Production and the Subject in the 21st Century* (Liverpool University Press): 84-102. See also Edit Andras, Keti Chukrov and Branko Dimitrijevia (eds.). 2009. *Gender Check: Femininity and Masculinity in the Art of Eastern Europe* (Walther König). *Bacon’s Dog* (2010) is an account of the first sexual experience of Peter Fay, a 65-year-old writer, curator, and art collector from Sydney, Australia. Dani Marti after having worked with Peter over a period of five months introduced him to physical intimacy in exchange for allowing him to film their encounters. See Kirsten Lloyd. 2011. ‘The Ethics of Encounter’ *Art Pulse*, 2/3 (Summer): 26-28.
life and art’. As Angela Dimitrakaki has argued, artistic practices of the last twenty years actualise the imperative of making art and life inseparable but as ‘a dystopia that introduces capital as social relation’. Whereas the performances of the historical avant-garde intended to react against art itself as a notion and condition, the performances of the 1960s wished to abolish the established meaning of art and create an alternative without rejecting art as notion. Yet the performances of the twenty-first century tend, through art, to critique life itself as a construct of capital’s biopolitical control of every aspect of reality.

Long-term performative projects of the last twenty years may also involve a number of people outside the art world in their realisation. In many cases, artists involve specific communities in the production of the artwork. These communities are in most cases asked to perform their identities, or rather specific aspects of their identities, as I argue in Chapter 4 through case studies. The labour of performing identities has preoccupied several theorists at least since the 1950s. In 1959, the sociologist Ervin Goffman published *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, in which he framed the theatrical performance that applies to face-to-face interactions. The core of Goffman's analysis lies in the relationship between performance and life. He argues that when an individual comes in contact with other people, he or she will attempt to control or guide the impression that others might have by changing or fixing his or her setting, appearance and manner. At the same time, the person the individual is interacting with is trying to form and obtain information about the individual. In 1990, the philosopher and gender theorist Judith Butler introduced the term ‘gender performativity’ in her now renowned study *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. A central aspect of Butler’s theory is that gender is not merely socially constructed, but produced through one’s own repetitive and compulsive performance of gender. According to Butler, to say that gender is performative is to argue that gender is ‘real only to the extent that it is performed’.

Likewise, life itself is, in its greatest part, a series of performative gestures.

54 Angela Dimitrakaki. 2013. *Τέχνη και Παγκοσμιοποίηση, Από το Μεταμοντέρνο Σημείο στη Βιοπολιτική Αρένα* [Art and Globalisation: From the Postmodern Sign to the Biopolitical Art and Globalisation], 247.
Art production and art reception in Greece has experienced and sustained great transformations since the 1990s. We can observe a systematic effort from institutions towards a more consistent development and exploration of contemporary art production, namely the art of the second half of the twentieth century. Specifically, the Macedonian Museum of Contemporary art was inaugurated in 1992, the State Museum of Contemporary Art (SMCA) was founded in 1997 and the Centre of Contemporary Art was developed as an autonomous section of the SMCA in 2001—all of which are in Thessaloniki, the country’s second largest urban centre and locus of much cultural activity, including major international festivals. Additionally, the National Museum of Contemporary Art in Athens began its operation in 2000, although its permanent building was only recently completed, in 2016. Furthermore, in 2007 two biennales were organised for the first time, one taking place in Athens and another in Thessaloniki. 57

Parallel to this belated growth of art institutions has been an increased interest in the investigation and practice of performance—not only by artists, but also by institutional contexts and curators. This interest becomes unmissable since the end of the 1990s. Several performance and video art festivals have been inaugurated in connection with performance art’s establishment in both art and academic institutions. 58 This turn could be detected in the wave of exhibitions featuring 1970s art that inevitably included work by artists who experimented with performative practices. More specifically, in 1999, architectural historian and theorist Giorgos Tzirtzilakis curated the exhibition and catalogue Π+Π=Δ. Νέα Τέχνη από τις Δεκαετίες του ’70 και του ’80. Επιλογές από τον ‘Δεσμό’ [P+P=D. New Art from the 1970s and 1980s. A Selection from Desmos Gallery]. The exhibition was organised at the Deste Foundation of Contemporary Art (funded by the major private collector Dakis Joannou) and presented artworks from Desmos cementing the gallery’s historical importance. Between 1971 and 1993, Athens-based Desmos contributed significantly to the nourishing of a contemporary Greek vanguard. It was one of the first art spaces that presented conceptual

57 The first Athens Biennale entitled Destroy Athens was held at Technopolis of Athens in 2007 (10 September - 2 December) and was organised by the Athens Biennale Non-Profit Organization (founded in November 2005) by Xenia Kalpaktsoglou, Poka-Yio and Augustine Zenakos who were also the curators of the first Biennale. For further information see http://athensbiennale.org/en/ [accessed 22/10/2013]. The first Thessaloniki Biennale in 2007 (21 May - 30 September), entitled Heterotopias was organised by The State Museum of Contemporary Art with the support of the Ministry of Culture of Greece and curated by Catherine David, Jan Erick Lundstrom, and Maria Tsantsanoglou. See http://thessalonikibiennale.gr/ [accessed 22/10/2013].

58 The proliferation of performative artistic practices will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 1.
art, installations and performance art.\textsuperscript{59} In 2005, the National Museum of Contemporary Art organised the exhibition \textit{The Years of Defiance: The Art of the 1970s in Greece}; while in 2006, the exhibition \textit{Great Unrest: Five Utopias in the 1970s, a Bit Before—a Bit After} took place in the city of Patras. Catalogues were published for both exhibitions with several essays trying to shed light on a period, or better decade, that has not been properly examined its significance for the history of modern Greece as the period of ‘Metapolitefsi’: the return to politics after the restoration of democracy in 1974. The above exhibitions did not focus specifically on performance art, but on diverse forms of art produced at the time. Along with exhibitions dedicated to the art of 1970s, a number of shows explored the body as subject matter. The exhibition \textit{Το Πάσχον Σώμα} [The Suffering Body], realised in 2004 at the Centre of Contemporary Art in Rethymno, Crete, tried to expose the ways disease and pain transform and deform the body, while the exhibition \textit{Μεταμφιέσεις: Θηλικότητα, Ανδροπρέπεια και άλλες Βεβαιότητες} [Masquerades: Femininity, Masculinity and other Certainties], organised by the SMCA in Thessaloniki in 2007, attempted to display the politics of gender identity.\textsuperscript{60} The two retrospectives of Leda Papaconstantinou, probably the most consistent advocate of performance art over the years, as mentioned earlier, were held in 2002 in Thessaloniki and in 2006 in both Athens and Thessaloniki.

The notion of performativity can also be detected in new ways of organising art festivals. In 2004 (21–23 May) the group d’ARTagnan organised an art festival under the title \textit{Vagabond: Art in Action}. Artists that lived and worked in Thessaloniki were invited to create an artwork—painting, sculpture, installation, photography, performance or video—in situ, transforming the site of the festival into a laboratory. Process, event, experience and platform were notions that started to be explored not only in terms of production but also in relation to the display of and encounter with art. The non-profit contemporary arts organisation Locus Athens curated the exhibition \textit{7 Performances and a Conversation} in 2005, which consisted of seven different artists’ performances realised at different times and locations. The Video Art Festival in Athens—which includes the medium of performance—was also inaugurated in 2005. Since the year 2007, a number of performance art festivals were organised by both official institutions and individuals. A more detailed account of them is given in Chapter 1.

\textsuperscript{59} Desmos’ archival material was donated to the Institute of Contemporary Art founded in 2009. For more information see \url{http://www.iset.gr/} [accessed 22/10/2013].

\textsuperscript{60} In \textit{The Suffering Body} the focus was set on the body as a metaphor for feelings and ideas, as a result of disease, wounds and torture. For further details see the exhibition catalogue Stavros Tsigoglou (ed.). 2004. \textit{The Suffering Body} (Nees Morphes Gallery). See also Syrago Tsiara. 2007. \textit{Μεταμφιέσεις: Θηλικότητα, Ανδροπρέπεια και άλλες Βεβαιότητες} [Masquerades: Femininity, Masculinity and other Certainties] (State Museum of Contemporary Art).
As already mentioned, performance art has been explored by a significant number of artists and theorists in Eastern Europe in addition to in the US and Western Europe. The exhibition and catalogue Body and the East: From the 1960s to the Present (1998) and the recent publication by art historian Amy Bryzgel Performance Art in Eastern Europe (2017), covering twenty-one countries and more than 250 artists who have engaged in performative practices since the 1960s, prove that performance art can no longer be considered a genre that flourished mainly in the West ‘proper’. As Bryzgel argues, Eastern European artists were both connected to and independent of developments in the West, evolving and advancing their performative work alongside artists in Western Europe and North America. Likewise, artists in Greece, as a western periphery, embraced performance art since the moment of its situated emergence. It is evident, moreover, that since the late 1990s, a younger generation of artists have engaged in performance even more systematically and exclusively than the artists of the 1960s and 1970s, most of whom were also practicing other forms of art along with performance. This performative turn in the field of art became even more obvious and intense after the economic crisis of 2009–2010 and its socio-political and economic turmoil, as discussed in Chapter 1. The art world’s manifest embrace of performance during the past two decades created a more fertile ground for the production and development of performance art overall. The absence—already mentioned—of a theoretical contextualisation of this work comes then as surprise; and yet it is fact—one which this research intends to help undo.

4. Chapter Outlines and Theoretical Framework

The thesis is divided into two parts, each comprising two or three chapters. The broader and more specific aims of this study dictated a structure that exceeds the limitations of a straightforward linear presentation of the material—despite the fact that such a linear history of Greek performance art does not yet exist. The arrangement and presentation of material in the thesis have been determined by the issues raised by, and addressed in, the diverse body of

---


62 The Greek Depression is the sovereign dept crisis faced by Greece in the aftermath of the global financial crisis of 2007-08. The Greek crisis started in late 2009; since then a strict austerity program has been applied to the country under the supervision of the European Union. The inhuman measures have led to a great number of revolts and protests throughout the years because of the socio-economic impact they had. A further analysis will be provided in Chapter 1.
work under examination, as well as the context in which this work and the broader theoretical framework developed as part of this study. Hence, Part I explores the politics of performance art in Greece through the prism of protest, intervention, and gender. Subsequently, Part II examines diversified forms of performance art, based on long-term processes or experienced through the document; some of the performative practices in question are dependent on the collaboration of specific communities, while others are only presented through the lens of a camera.

Part I: The Politics of Performance Art in Greece

Chapter 1, *Performance Art and Political Protest: Sites, Audiences, and Gestures of Resistance*, is divided into four sections. The first one offers an introduction to the emergence of performance art in Greece. Having taken into consideration the origins of performance art and the circumstances under which it appeared in the US and Western Europe, section 1 focuses on the specific socio-political and cultural framework in which the first performances took place in Greece. The chapter begins with a concise history of the rise of the military Junta (1967-1974) and proceeds to a discussion on the regime of censorship imposed by the Junta and the violation of human rights. Through the work of Maria Karavela, Theodoros (Papadimitriou), and Dimitris Alithinos, section 1 examines the critical responses of performance art to the aforementioned conditions imposed by the Junta and indicates the connections between fascism and capitalism, drawing on the writings of Nicos Poulantzas, Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze, and Félix Guattari. The section then concludes by discussing the influence of censorship on the generation of a new artistic language through Foucault and Karen Van Dyck’s analyses of the productive possibilities of censorship. The second section proceeds to a presentation of the socio-political conditions after the fall of the Junta and discusses the evolution of performance just after the process of democratisation during Metapolitefsi. In addition to the work of the previously mentioned artists, the second part also refers to Titsa Grekou and Nikos Zouboulis to discuss the diverse approaches to the genre of performance that emerged after the political struggles. Subsequently, the third section presents a critical assessment of performance art in the recession years since 2009. I examine the work of Mary Zygouri, Marios Chatziprokopiou, and the duo Myrto Tsilimpoundi and Ally Walsh to underscore the aesthetics of protest employed in performance art during the first years of the financial crisis. Michel Foucault’s concept of the ‘docile body’ is used to analyse the way in which the body is seen and treated in these performances. Finally, the fourth section of the chapter concerns the way in which performance art in Greece can be situated within the
framework of institutional critique, even if such an intention has not been explicitly declared by the artists themselves, and in contrast to the suggestion of some Greek art historians that the performative artistic practices of the 1970s did not point to a critique of the institution but were instead solely interested in being anti-dictatorial. The writings of Simon Sheikh and Andrea Fraser on institutional critique are consulted.

Overall, the chapter aims to question dominant arguments by Greek art historians that the experimental art of the 1970s was bound to have limited impact on specific audiences because of the absence of a solid institutional framework and the lack of art education and awareness of the Greek audience. On the contrary, as my analysis shows, it is the most recent performances whose impact on the viewers might be questioned. The conclusion of Chapter 1 suggests an alternative reading of the works through Slavoj Žižek’s concept of ‘objective violence’ and its connection to the biopolitical violence of capitalism.

Chapter 2: Performance as Intervention: Participation, the Public Sphere, and the Production of Meaning considers interventionist performance practices in public and semi-public spaces of urban environments. The chapter maps different typologies of performative interventions in relation to a work’s interaction with the public space. My intention is to show through the Greek paradigm that the contribution of performance art, in all of the different cases examined, lies in the disruption of the constructed ‘normality’ imposed in public spaces. Yet, as will be shown, such a disruption is not always achieved. The first section of the chapter discusses the question of public space and art. The second one then examines the influence of place and identity on the practice of intervention through the work of the duo Alexandra Katsiani and Thanasis Chodros, Evangelia Basdekis, Georgia Sagri, Rosina Ivanova, Jennifer Nelson, and Toby Short. Mary Zygouri’s post-performative participatory work is subsequently examined in the following section, which explores intervention through the strategy of integration. Finally, the fourth section of the chapter examines collective intervention. This part sheds light on the public interventions of the groups Katalipsi [Squat] and Karatransavantgardia [a self-mocking, humorous appellation tentatively translated as ultratransavangardia], side-lined for many years, which took place in the 1980s and 1990s to claim better conditions for the development of contemporary art in Greece. The work of the group Urban Void, who wished to reclaim unused parts of the city of Athens, is also considered, along with the actions of Thessaloniki’s flash mob ‘Sfina’, who aimed to subvert place identity. Flash mobs, a form of mass performance, create surreal situations in urban
environments. Their main focus is enjoyment, as stated by their participants; but are they apolitical and meaningless interventions in urban space and everyday life? The chapter suggests a reading of interventions as ‘events’ through the theory of Alain Badiou and Chantal Mouffe’s idea that to be political does not require ‘making a total break with the existing state of affairs’, and concludes by arguing that ‘democracy’ is not always art’s best friend.63

Chapter 3: The Politics of Gender and the Performative Body explores the unclear relationship between performance art and the feminist movement in Greece from the 1970s up to the 2010s. Performance art in Western Europe and the US was an ideal match for the feminist discourse of the late 1960s and 1970s, when feminist artists explored autobiography, the female body, and politics. Feminism played a crucial role in developing and expanding the paradigm of performance. Although the feminist movement had a strong presence in Greece in the late 1970s and 1980s, however, only few artists situated their work within feminist politics. Yet a significant reason for the absence of feminist readings is the absence of a feminist theoretical approach in most cases. The chapter examines performance from the 1970s up to the 2010s and maintains that several artworks can and must indeed be related to gender politics and feminist issues. I examine the work of Leda Papaconstantinou, Niki Kanagini, Foteini Kalle, The Girls, and Angeliki Avgitidou to consider various aspects of the female identity: reproduction, the politics of beauty, domestic labour, and patience and passivity as a form of tolerance but also of resistance. The concept of ‘symbolic violence’ as defined by Pierre Bourdieu and Ann Oakley’s sociological research on housework is used to explore women’s consensus to, and internalising of, their own oppression. Moreover, Chapter 3 shows that although it has been used by artists as a medium to transmit radical ideas and expose constructed gender roles, performance art can also become a carrier of conservatism and contribute to the reinforcement of gender stereotypes.

Part II: Diversifying Performance: Community Inclusion, Experience Economy, and the Document

Chapter 4: Community-based Art and the ‘Absence’ of the Artist examines three case studies of post-performance practices in which performance was identified as the very process of producing the artwork: Maria Papadimitriou’s Temporary Autonomous Museum for All,

Marios Spiliopoulos’s *Human Trace*, and the project *Egnatia: A Journey of Displaced Memories*. All three were durational collaborative projects that involved specific communities in their actualisation. The projects share common characteristics but are also defined by their differences. In every case, the artists assumed the role of coordinator and director of a series of events and actions that were initiated by them and completed with the participation of different communities: the Roma community in Avliza in the first case; the residents of Eleusina, a small de-industrialised town near Athens but with a glorious history in the Antiquity, in the second; and the refugees and immigrants in Lavrio Refugee Centre and elsewhere along the Egnatia road in the third. The creation of communication networks and the production of personal—both social and friendly—relations were means of the artistic practice in all three projects. Yet, while in *Egnatia Road* the process was the artwork itself, in the other two cases the process was concluded with a monumental installation (*Human Trace*) or a series of photographs, videos, and installations (*T.A.M.A.*). In this chapter, I use the writings of Dan Karlholm, Angela Dimitrakaki, and Claire Bishop to discuss the notions of ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ audiences. Moreover, drawing on the theory of philosopher Leszek Koczanowicz that antagonism and consensus are not inevitably contradictory but can be treated as complementary, I suggest that a combination and coexistence of dialogue and antagonism is not impossible but in fact imperative. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the oft-marginalised in Greece subject matter of identity politics, suggesting that sometimes, instead of treating identities as assemblages that escape any conventional categorisation, such projects carry the risk of reinforcing the notion of fixed identities. I also discuss the issue of friendship in relation to politics and particularly democracy—another undertheorised topic in Greece - through the examination of Jacques Rancière’s *The Politics of Friendship*. Could such artistic projects be perceived as a more community-friendly sub-genre of performance? Finally, through Judith Butler’s theory on performativity, the chapter investigates whether the fusing of art and life in such post-performance practices has the attributes of performance or in fact abolishes it.

While at the beginning performance art required a live audience, nowadays the conditions of its realisation have changed. Diverse forms of performative practices and their interrelation with the document are the main issues under consideration in the fifth and final chapter, entitled *Making the Invisible Visible: Performance, Intermediality, and the Document*. Since each performance is in fact an ephemeral action, it can only remain in history through the document, which is most often a photographic one. At the same time, photographs can also
be performatively constructed, i.e. they can operate as performances in their own right. Respectively, the moving image also constitutes both a medium of performance documentation and an artwork in itself. But is the visual document adequate to capture and transmit not only the artist’s action but also the viewer’s experience and the social event that a performance is? Moreover, how have the latest technological conditions and the revolution of digital and social media affected the production and dissemination of performance documentation? Through different examples that illustrate the various uses of the document produced during the performative process or action, this chapter considers how photography and video mediate performance, what forms of art they can produce, and what forms of spectatorship they support.

The chapter is divided into five sections, each exploring different aspects of the performative document. The first one looks at the conditions of document production, circulation, and preservation in Greece, and the ways in which they have affected performance art’s (in)visibility. Leda Papaconstantinou’s work is an exemplary case of the documenter’s influence on the visual document, while Maria Paschalidou’s work Visibility promotes the circulation of the digital document outside art spaces in an attempt to reach working-class audiences. Subsequently, drawing upon the writings of art historians Peggy Phelan, Amelia Jones, Kathy O’Dell, Phillip Auslander, Erika Fischer Lichte, artist Cathrine Elwes, and sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, the second section discusses the privileging of live over mediated experience and the shift in performance art discourse from the production of meaning to the production of affect. The new ways of performance production and transmission have blurred the boundaries between live and mediated, and generated new modes of spectatorship. Next, the recent trend of re-enactment as an alternative to the document is explored in the third section, which aims to illustrate the (im)possibilities of performance reiteration and the concerns it raises in relation to the artists’ labour. The fourth part then investigates specific case studies that either reject the production of visual documentation, as in the case of Georgia Sagri’s Confession, or confront its weaknesses and impossibilities, as in the case of Yannis Melanitis’s Pleasure Machine 2/Blind Date, where it is impossible for the visual document to depict the participants’ experience of the performance. Finally, the last section discusses the relationship of the document to the art market and the undervaluation of performance artists’ labour, using the project Performers Xpress by Angeliki Avgitidou and Foteini Kalle as an example. In the chapter’s conclusions, I reflect on the several ‘turns’ that have taken place in art over the last 30 years or so and their
impact on performance art both as a live action/social event and as documentation. Through John Dewey’s theory on the reception of all forms of art as experience, James Gilmore and Joseph Pine’s analysis of experience and transformation economy, Maurizio Lazzarato’s thoughts on immaterial labour, and Bojana Kunst’s analysis of the relationship between artistic work and artistic labour in the proximity of capitalism, Chapter 5 aims to provide an exegesis of the current obsession with ‘liveness’ that is apparent not only in Greece but worldwide. It further aims to draw connections between performance art and neoliberal capitalism. Finally, the chapter concludes by contradicting Michael Kirby’s argumentation on the necessity for the production of solely ‘objective’ documentation of live art. I suggest that new modes of documentation are inescapably required to preserve the most complete experience and knowledge possible of performative artistic practices in the histories of art.
Part I

The Politics of Performance Art
Chapter 1

Performance Art and Political Protest: Sites, Audiences and Gestures of Resistance

Introduction

The central aim of this chapter is to explore the conditions under which performance art made its appearance in Greece. While the first performances by Greek artists had already taken place in European capitals during the 1960s, performance art was only accepted by the Greek art establishment under the specific conditions of a dictatorship. Artists such as Takis and Leda Papaconstantinou had already given performances in France and the UK, respectively, in the 1960s, when performance was still shunned by Greece’s largely conservative art institutions. I argue that performance art emerged in Greece when the country was in an exceptional state—indeed, one of emergency—due to the military regime that was instituted on the 21st of April 1967 and lasted until 1974. Although performance art retained and expanded its presence through diverse manifestations during the 1980s and 1990s, it was only a few years until the country was once again in a state of emergency as a result of the economic crisis of 2009-10, which, in many cases, provided an excuse for undermining civil liberties and eroding the Greek democratic constitution established during the late 1970s. Under these challenging circumstances, performative practices became popular within both institutional and alternative art spaces.

The first chapter is divided into four sections. The first section is comprised of an overview of the rise of the military Junta and its practices and an analysis of the first performative environments and practices that arose in Greece as expressions of resistance. Art and politics became inseparable as a result of the threat, and subsequent reality, of censorship and the need to develop a new oppositional artistic language, the ‘extreme’ form of which would reflect the extreme political circumstances of its genesis. The second section explores the socio-political conditions in Greece after the restoration of democracy and the consequences of the events of 1989 for the country. Part two also explores the continuation of such politically charged performative practices after the restoration of democracy in the 1970s and 1980s; it also presents a case study that reflects a rather formalistic approach to performance. The third
section provides an analysis of the conditions and parameters of the financial crisis of 2009 (culminating in Greece receiving International Monetary Fund [IMF] financing in 2010) and the changes it brought to Greek society. The austerity measures provoked a series of protests and riots, and performance art became, for the second time, a vehicle of protest. In the years of recession, performance art has flourished more than ever in Greece and is being explored in diverse ways not only by artists but also by institutions. The chapter argues that social ruptures caused by either dictatorships or economic recessions may lead to radical artistic communicative processes. The fourth part of this chapter discusses institutional critique and suggests, in contrast to some art historians’ arguments, that, despite the evident lack of artistic institutions in Greece, artists were concerned about the quality of such institutions and critiqued them through their performative practices, even if they did so from within such institutions.

1. Censorship and the Critical Responses of Greek Performance Art

1.1 The Rise of the Military Junta: A Concise History

The US’ active intervention in the Vietnam War in the mid-1960s prompted mass peace demonstrations worldwide and generated an anti-imperialist and anti-authoritarian atmosphere. The spirit of defiance culminated with the student and worker revolt of May 1968, a political, cultural and sexual revolution. While the students of Paris were asking for the impossible—‘be realistic, ask for the impossible’—and attempting to question the legitimacy of the existing order, Greece was experiencing a period of political crisis.64 The year 1967 was significant in the history of modern Greece as a result of a group of right-wing army officers seizing power and imposing a military dictatorship that came to be known as the Regime of the Colonels or the Junta.65 This dictatorship arose after a period of political instability in the country that interrupted the normal course of politics, social life and the

economy. The national division between the forces of the left and the right can be traced to the resistance against the Nazi occupation of Greece during World War II.\textsuperscript{66}

After being liberated in 1944, Greece descended into a civil war (1946-1949), which was fought between the communist forces of EAM-ELAS and the national army, the latter of which had the direct support of Britain and the US. After the communists surrendered, the Greek government cultivated a policy of targeted terror as a pre-emptive response to a possible communist revolution.\textsuperscript{67} The right-wing political party the National Radical Union, formed in 1955 by Konstantinos Karamanlis, won the elections of 1956, 1958 and 1961, with the last being described as characterised by ‘violence and fraud’. Up until 1961, the National Radical Union developed policies to control the press, with the intention of creating an authoritarian regime. These mechanisms were employed by army officers and both Greek and foreign journalists, whose salaries were paid from the secret funds of the Directorate General of Press and Information and Central Intelligence Agency. The army officers involved in securing these mechanisms used this experience to form a dictatorship.\textsuperscript{68} Although the regime superficially remained a parliamentary democracy under a constitutional monarchy, power had, in fact, passed into the hands of extra-parliamentary forces who established a parallel government that suspended the official elected one. This extra-parliamentary government consisted of the king, the army (which depended on NATO support and was led by a secret

\textsuperscript{66} The years 1937-1941 the Greeks had suffered another dictatorship imposed by the General Ioannis Metaxas who carried out a self-coup with royal support on 4 August 1936. Greece entered World War II on 28 October 1940 and remained occupied until 1944. The first major resistance group was the National Liberation Front (EAM). EAM was a political movement organised by the Communist Party of Greece (KKE) and other smaller parties. Soon the first ‘andartes’ (guerrillas/partisans) joined ELAS and many battles were fought and won against both the Italians and Nazis. The eminence of EAM, its tendency towards a deep social reform and the ascendance of the communist party lead to the creation of other resistance groups such The National Republican Greek League (EDES). The political tensions between the Resistance groups resulted in the outbreak of a civil conflict among them in late 1943, which continued until the spring of 1944. For further information on the Greek history regarding the specific period see Nikos Svoronos, 1994. \textit{Επισκόπηση της Νεοελληνικής Ιστορίας} [Overview of Modern Greek History] (Themelio), 119-153. Apostolos Vakalopoulos, Vakalopoulos, Apostolos. 2005. \textit{Νίκη Ελληνική Ιστορία} 1204-1985 [New Greek History 1204-1985] (Vanias), 395-474. Nikos Alivizatos. 1995. \textit{Οι Πολιτικοί Θρησκεύονται σε Κρίση 1922-1974, Όψεις της Ελληνικής Εμπειρίας} [Political Institutions in Crisis 1922-1974, Aspects of the Greek Experience] (Themelio).


organisation called IDEA, standing for *Ieros Desmos Ellinon Axiomatikon* [Sacred Bond of Greek Officers]), the CIA, the police and paramilitary forces.69

The assassination of left-wing politician Grigoris Labrakis on the 22nd of May 1963, shortly after he had delivered his keynote address at an anti-war meeting in Thessaloniki, by two right-wing extremists led to rapid political developments. Prime Minister Konstantinos Karamanlis resigned and left for Paris in July 1963. Thousands of Greek youths formed a new political organisation called *Neolaia Lambraki* [Lambrakis Youth]. This leftist political organisation played a decisive role in Greece’s progressive movement during the 1960s.70

In February 1964, the party of George Papandreou won the elections with a percentage of 52.72%, resulting in Papandreou forming the first majority government with 171 MPs. It was the first non-right-wing government since 1933. A period of instability was initiated as a result of the controversy between George Papandreou and King Constantine regarding the Minister of National Defence and the Head of the General Staff.71 Eventually, Papandreou, unable to accept that the Prime Minister could not take up any ministry he wished, resigned on the 15th of July 1965. The specific date has been recorded in the political history of Greece as a ‘royal coup’. Georgios Athanasiadis-Nova, a member of the Centre Union, was sworn in as Prime Minister on the very day of Papandreou’s resignation. On the 21st of July, the streets of Athens were filled with demonstrators protesting against the overthrow of the legitimate (elected) Prime Minister Papandreou. The protests ended in conflicts with police forces, during which 200 protesters were injured, 250 arrested and a 25-year-old student and member

---

69 Svoronos, 1994, 144-145. The Sacred Bond of Greek Officers was a secret organisation of the Greek Army officers whose intention was the complete dissolution of the communist movement and the establishment and reproduction of military apparatus in the post-war state of Greece or, according to the terminology of a secret internal document of IDEA ‘IDEA’s dictatorship’. Spyros Linardos. 1977. *Από τον Εμφύλιο στη Χούντα* [From the Civil War to the Junta], volume 1 (Papazisis), 235. For a detailed account on the history and action of IDEA organisation see Dimitris Paralikas. 1982. *Συνωμοσίες: ΙΔΕΑ-ΑΣΠΙΔΑ* [Conspiracies: IDEA-ASPIDA] (Vasdekis).


71 Papandreou wanted to replace the minister Peter Garoufalias with his son, Andreas Papandreou. The King, however, expressed strongly his refusal to consent, unless he first approved of the replacements. Garoufalias, with the full support of the Palace, refused to resign, even when G. Papandreou expelled him from the Union Centre. Papandreou offered to become himself the Ministry of Defence but King Constantine wanted to have his own person of trust.
of the left, Sotiris Petroulas, was killed. The period that followed is known as *Iouliana* [the July Days] or *Apostasia* [Apostasy].

The July Days, later named the ‘Greek May’ (as the equivalent of the May 1968 uprising in France), was one of the largest social revolts experienced in contemporary Greek society and in the history of the labour movement. Greece’s July 1965 and France’s May 1968 protests were part of the global revolutionary wave that took place between 1965 and 1975. Historian Sofronis Papadopoulos suggests that the Greek 1965 was the forerunner of the ‘International 1968’ not only because it preceded the latter chronologically but also because the social issues expressed in both uprisings had a great deal in common: an intense questioning of urban institutions and the organisation of everyday life, mobilisation of huge masses, widespread challenging of reformist parties, new forms of struggle and a resurgence and strengthening of the ‘extreme’ revolutionary left. The period that followed the ousting of the government of George Papandreou has been generally regarded as characterised by political instability.

During the short interval between 1963 and 1967, Greece, under the government of George Papandreou, experienced a brief cultural spring, an opening to new ideas and creativity. The journal *Επιθεώρηση Τέχνης* [Art Review] was going through its second phase, while new magazines, such as *Εποχές* [Seasons] and *Πάλη* [Struggle], were launched. In addition, two nationwide exhibitions and the great international exhibition of art historian and critic Tonis Spiteris took place, along with new cinematographic productions. A kind of cultural revolution was also experienced in music, including the work of Mikis Theodorakis, Manos Hatzidakis and Yannis Christou; theatre similarly experienced a new burst of productivity as a result of the work of Iakovos Kambanelis, Loula Anagnostaki, Margarita Lymberaki and

---


74 From the end of July 1965 until the end of December 1966, King Constantine tried various times to form a government with the participation of 48 parliamentarians of the Center Union party (apostates) who left George Papandreou. The term ‘apostasy’ came from the characterisation ‘apostates’ attributed to members of the Union Centre who participated or gave a vote of confidence in the governments of this period. The new government (with appointed Prime Minister Georgios Athanasiadis-Novia) did not have a majority in parliament, so formed another government, led by Elias Tsirikos. The conflict had economic causes: When the Union Centre came to power, Papandreou had imposed on millionaire Tom Papas the renegotiation of the contracts for refineries ESSO (the current SEEs eko). Papas reacted and pressured the Greek government through the links he had with the US government to stop its socialist reforms. In autumn 1964, the Center Union government forced Papas to sign a new contract with ESSO PAPAS, eliminating most of the monopolies he had. The CIA and the multinational ESSO did not retreat but undermined the Papandreou government. For further information see Linardos, 1986, Volumes 5.
The 1960s were a decade of progress for the visual arts in Greece; exhibition spaces proliferated in Athens, while the number of exhibitions and art-related events multiplied. Outside of the capital, art activities also expanded in smaller cities such as Thessaloniki, Volos, Patra and Iraklion. The number of art critics and art magazines started to grow. The audience’s interest was also more evident, not only in terms of attendance but also in art sales. Private initiatives continued to play an important role in funding and organising art events, while communication channels between Greece and the dominant art centres of the West opened to artists and their works. Generally, the 1960s were a promising decade for the Greek art scene.

On the 21st of April 1967, just weeks before the scheduled elections, a group of right-wing army officers led by Brigadier Stylianos Pattakos and Colonels George Papadopoulos and Nikolaos Makarezos seized power in a coup d’etat. According to the ideology of the regime, however, the Junta was the product of revolution, not a coup. The objective of this revolution was, in brief, to ‘save the country, in its critical hour, from descending into chaos, division and red totalitarianism’. The colonels were able to swiftly seize power using surprise, confusion and violence. Pattakos was commander of the Armour Training Centre based in Athens. The coup leaders placed tanks in strategic positions in Athens, effectively gaining complete control of the city. At the same time, a large number of small mobile units were dispatched to arrest leading politicians and authority figures, as well as many ordinary citizens suspected of left-wing sympathies, according to lists prepared in advance.

1.2 The Impact of 1967 on the Visual Arts

This political turmoil did not leave the cultural life of the country unaffected. The dictatorship had a twofold impact on the evolution of the visual arts in Greece: As mentioned previously,
the military regime emerged at a time when the visual arts scene had started to flourish and the audience’s interest was growing—an upswing interrupted in the light of martial law and the witch hunts among the left initiated by the Junta. The new regime fostered a return to representational, populist forms of art, and the creative dialogue between artists in Greece and abroad that had started in the 1960s was abruptly terminated. Many artists were forced to leave the country, and communication between artists and viewers was suspended; it had to be rebuilt on a different basis.

However, the political situation also contributed to the rise and acceptance of new artistic mediums in Greece and prompted a political turn in art and a reconsideration of the relationship between viewer and artwork. The dialogue between art and life that had existed since the historical avant-garde in the West as a result of Dadaism, surrealism and constructivism became an essential concern for Greek artists who intended to oppose the military regime. In what follows, I discuss how the military regime ‘forced’ the cultivation of and experimentation with new practices in the visual arts. My contention is that the establishment and rise of performance art in Greece reflects both the political ferment of the time and a flight from traditional media.

1.3 The Regime of Censorship and Violation of Human Rights

The Greek colonels had little or no intellectual interest in the works of creative imagination in any field. However, it became quite evident that they feared the activist potential of such works and artists. During the days that followed the takeover, teams of conspirators rounded up a large number of ‘dangerous left-wing’ writers and other artists, and, after interrogation, shipped some of them off, along with other political prisoners, to detention camps on the islands of Leros, Youra, Yaros, Crete, etc. Furthermore, the Junta established severe prepublication censorship laws, including a provision that any writer who wished to publish

80 Xydis, 1976, 252-253.
81 An important effort to stress the significance of the 1970s in the evolution of contemporary Greek art has been made with the exhibitions The Years of Defiance. The Art of the 1970s in Greece, organised in 2005-2006 by the National Museum of Contemporary Art in Athens and Great Unrest, 5 Utopias in the 70s, a Bit Before – a Bit After realised in 2006 in Patra. For further details see the exhibition catalogues Bia Papadopoulou (ed.), 2006 and Thanasis Moutsopoulos (ed.), 2006.
82 On the unification of art and life intended by the avant-garde see Peter Bürger [Translated from the German by Michael Shaw]. 1984. Theory of the Avant-Garde (University of Minnesota Press).
his/her work, or any producer who wished to stage a play, had to submit his or her manuscript in person to a board of censors composed of military officers. The list of forbidden texts was, however, not restricted to Greek writers. The list identified 1,046 works, including those of Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, T.S Eliot, Thomas Mann, Federico Garcia Lorca and hundreds of other writers. In the first three years of the Junta regime, the list also included the tragic Greek poets Aeschylus, Euripides, Sophocles and the philosopher Aristotle. The Greek poets Kostas Palamas and Dionisios Solomos were also censored, along with all of the films that starred Eirini Papa and Melina Merkouri and all of the songs of Mikis Theodorakis. Anyone who was found to be in violation of the list would be subsequently arrested and immediately put on trial in a martial court.\textsuperscript{84} Censorship was also imposed on visual artists, and, during the seven years of the dictatorship, several exhibitions were cancelled, forbidden or destroyed. Specific examples are examined later in this chapter.

The colonels’ conservative stance also manifested in the reinstitution of Katharevousa (a peculiar form of ancient Greek) as the official language of the state and the country.\textsuperscript{85} It is worth mentioning the symbolic significance of this action, as this language was created by the conservative movement during the nineteenth century in an attempt to ‘to supersede and therefore neutralise the politically radical potential of the “vulgar” (idiom) [δημοτική], the spoken language of the people’.\textsuperscript{86} The colonels wished to create a country comprised solely of Greek Christians: No atheists or communists would be accepted in their regime. Hence, whoever failed to comply with these requirements and was identified as dissident would have to suffer the consequences, namely, exile, imprisonment and/or a variety of methods of torture, which sometimes led to death. The brutality of the torture used during imprisonment, usually in order to force a confession, was unspeakable; it consisted of both physical and psychological violence.\textsuperscript{87}

\textsuperscript{84}Rafailidis. 1993, 421.
\textsuperscript{85}Katharevousa is a conservative form of the modern Greek language conceived in the early 19th century as a compromise between Ancient Greek and Dimotiki of the time.
\textsuperscript{86}Spanos, 1973, 365.
\textsuperscript{87}For a detailed account of the tortures see Pericles Korovessis. 1970. \textit{The Method. A Personal Account of the Tortures in Greece} (Allison & Busby). Giannis Katris also refers to a variety of tortures employed by the colonels in \textit{Η Γέννηση του Νεοφασισμού στην Ελλάδα} [The Rebirth of Neofascism in Greece], 257-298.
1.4 Gestures of Resistance

According to Vasilis Rafailidis, many academics endorsed the dictatorship, while intellectuals kept silent; a few spoke out in support of their beliefs, but the majority, out of fear, remained silent. ‘Passive resistance’ was the most common stance. Although there were a few instances of active resistance, these were all initiated and executed by individuals. The best-known possible act of resistance was Alexandros Panagoulis’s attempt to assassinate the dictator Papadopoulos. Panagoulis was arrested and sentenced to death, but, after the intervention of European governments (with the exceptions of Turkey, Spain and Portugal), the death penalty was suspended. Active resistance was also undertaken by the academic Sakis Karagiorgas, who was arrested when a makeshift bomb exploded in his hands. Around 300 bombs exploded in Athens; among the locations targeted were the National Bank at Syntagma Square and the Hilton Hotel.\textsuperscript{88} Interestingly, the Hilton Hotel was where Maria Karavela presented one of her performative environments, which is examined later in this chapter.

Passive resistance and/or tolerance were adopted by the great majority of people not only because of fear. While the regime generated genuine discontent, it also enjoyed considerable support from the public, who saw embracing authoritarianism as a necessary political response to endemic social problems.\textsuperscript{89} Actual popular resistance was undertaken by some thirty organisations with modest memberships and lifespans. Those acts of resistance that were actually undertaken seemed to be only symbolic of popular opposition to the regime and could not lead to the subversion of the dictatorship.\textsuperscript{90} Most members of these resistance groups—which mainly consisted of students, intellectuals and members of left-wing organisations—had already been involved in political activities before the period of the dictatorship and were therefore known to the prosecutors. Thus, they were very often arrested and exiled or imprisoned and tortured. It was only at the end of 1972 and the beginning of 1973 that mass mobilisation, mainly involving university students, took place, and some


\textsuperscript{89} See Kornetis, 2015, 100-112.

\textsuperscript{90} Their actions were narrowed to banners, slogans, pamphlets and bombings. See Notaras, Gerasimos. 1999. ‘Δικτατορία και Οργανωμένη Αντίσταση’ [Dictatorship and Organised Resistance] in Yanna, Rigos Alkis, Seferiadis Serafim (eds.), 1999, 187-198.
organs of the state, such as the Navy, also took action against the dictatorship. Widespread demonstrations culminated in the Athens National Technical University (Polytechneio) uprising of 1973. The uprising began on 14 November, escalated to a full-fledged anti-junta revolt and ended in bloodshed early on the morning of the 17th of November.

In the first three years of the dictatorship, the withdrawal of artists was apparent. The first art exhibition of a political character was held in May 1969 by the artist Vlassis Kaniaris and signalled, in a way, the artist’s attempt to break the silence. The exhibition took place at the Nea Gallery in Athens; its objective was not only to protest against the regime but also to raise the viewers’ awareness and snap them out of their apathy. The works displayed included constructed human figures and objects that were immersed in plaster and entwined with barbed wire and carnations. The objects chosen by the artist held a symbolic meaning, which, however, could be easily decoded by the audience. The plaster, later used by other artists, constituted a direct reference to Colonel Papadopoulos’s infamous expression regarding the ‘condition’ of the country: ‘Greece is sick. We had to put it in plaster. It shall remain in plaster until it recovers’ [Η Ελλάς ασθενεί. Την έχομε θέσει εις τον γύψον. Θα παραμείνῃ εις τον γύψον μέχρι ότου ιαθεί]. No catalogue was published for the exhibition, as Kaniaris himself had censored the texts in order to avoid having the show shut down. His aim was to keep the exhibition from being targeted so that other artists working in the context of resistance would not be discouraged. Instead of a catalogue, each visitor was offered a red carnation growing in a small plaster cube, again symbolic of the idea that the carnation could grow despite the plaster. A few days before the exhibition, Kaniaris had sent abroad three packages containing some of the small plaster cubes with the carnations, photographs of the works and a biography so that they could be used in the event of the exhibition being targeted by the dictators (as he feared). The exhibition was a great success: Kaniaris had to make another thousand plaster cubes with carnations for visitors during the 21 days of the show’s duration. Even the international press covered the story. After the exhibition, the artist was forced to migrate in order to avoid persecution and arrest.

---


Three facets of this specific piece, which are also discernible in the work of other artists examined in this chapter, signified a new era for contemporary Greek art. The first characteristic to be discussed is the use of symbolic—yet easily decoded—language in an effort to transmit a concrete and lucid message to the viewers; this reflects an intense effort on the part of the artist to communicate a specific message and to engage in dialogue with viewers. Second, the artistic work features direct commentaries on the political and social issues of the time. The concept of art operating as a form of resistance and consequently mingling with life is reinforced if we consider the conditions of censorship and the very real possibility of the artist’s imprisonment, torture and/or exile. Last, but critical for the purposes of this study, is the introduction of human presence and performative practices. The artist invites the viewer to become a participant in the completion of the artwork and, by extension, in the construction of the socio-political space that is created in the gallery. In other words, the viewer-participant is encouraged to act as a co-conspirator, which, in turn, means that the audience is possibly put at risk.

During the late 1960s, the premises of Western art dictated that artworks should no longer remain confined to museum spaces but should instead function outside of them, in everyday life spaces. However, for Greek artists, the need to break with display conventions stemmed from a need to act and contribute to a politics of resistance by means of concealed
communication. Art critic Eleni Vakalo notes that a profound change in the relationship between artists and audience took place during the dictatorship, but maintains that the public remained largely conservative and non-receptive to the radical break with display-based art introduced by circumstances, performance and conceptual art in general. She argues that, in order for such forms of art to function and have an effect, their audiences should be equally willing to escape long-standing conventions. For Vakalo, both social conditions and a lack of aesthetic education prevented the public from appreciating the radical concept of art as action. I argue, however, that the language used by certain artists, though novel, unconventional and alien, was well received by the Greek public precisely because of the social conditions and despite their lack of aesthetic education. It appealed to those who wished to identify platforms for expressing—preferably safely—their opposition to the regime, and thus the issue of aesthetic education was irrelevant. Visitors to specific exhibitions were not necessarily interested in the new forms of art or art in general; rather, they were interested in enhancing the potential for collective political participation. The audience’s responsiveness did not arise from a desire to participate in an artistic project or to become part of the artwork but from an emotional imperative to negate the negation of politics imposed by the military state, to oppose an alienated everydayness by embracing an alien art.

1.5 Performance Art as Politics in Disguise

In the early 1970s, Maria Karavela was among the first artists to introduce installations/artistic environments and performance to the Greek public. She moved beyond the conventional visual arts practices and engaged with new forms of art that were intended to engage more closely with life. Her work featured socio-political implications and addressed issues such as authority, violence, oppression, lack of freedom and overt or covert fascism. Although, at the time, her early works were mainly referred to as environments in the Greek press (a description that persists in later bibliographical references, which remain sparse), performativity was an integral part of her work.

93 Vakalo, 1985, 60-67.
94 Ibid., 89-90.
Karavela’s first performative work was presented to the Greek public in 1970, in Athens’ Astor Gallery. In her autobiographical notes, she uses the term ‘site’ [χώρος] to refer to the specific piece, as well as to subsequent actions taken at the site.95 The environment she created featured items that were intended to subvert the established concept of the aesthetic value of an artwork. A white life-sized human figure made of plaster, imprisoned in a cage, dominated the space. Bulky ‘sacks encasing body parts, presumably of the dead’ were placed along the walls of the gallery. Other sacks were tied together and placed randomly throughout the space. Posters on the walls, two pieces of furniture, letters scattered on the floor and a ladder leading nowhere completed the environment. In addition, the monotonous sound of water dripping was integrated into the environment. The entire gallery space was covered with black paper.96 The exhibition lasted for only a few days, after which the work was dismantled; thus, the concept of ephemerality was introduced to Greek visual arts, emphasising the concept of art as an event and the fact that the action ends along with the exhibition, without any intention for it to be preserved or put on permanent display.

Figure 4.2: Maria Karavela, Untitled, Environment/Performance, 1970, Astor Gallery, Athens.

95Maria Karavela, cv, Maria Karavela AICA Archive.
According to art critic Alexandros Xydis, this was the first artistic environment ever presented in Greece.\(^ {97}\) The artist’s live presence on site seems to be a minor detail, one that was omitted in almost all references. However, the limited amount of photographic evidence reveals that the artist was present in the environment, wearing a prison uniform and standing by the sacks. One of the visitors, who stayed in the gallery for twenty minutes, has confirmed that Karavela was present during his visit, walking about and moving the sacks around. Visitors were well aware of the fact that the action taking place at the Astor Gallery was considered illegal; it would therefore be unsafe to stay in the gallery for long.\(^ {98}\) In a review published in the major national paper Τα Νέα [The News], the painter Alekos Kontopoulos implies that the artist was present at/in the work. Kontopoulos observed that, in this ‘space/site’, a new form of ‘liberation’ was presented, as the artist herself could move about within her work and invite visitors to do the same. He had to justify Karavela’s presence in the space by arguing, parenthetically, that ‘it felt as if’ the work demanded her participation in order to animate the installation.\(^ {99}\) At the time, the unfamiliarity of Greek art critics, the press and the public with the practice of performance led to the impression that Karavela’s work was solely an environment—that is, an extension of sculptural practice. Moreover, the mishandling of photographic documentation (which is further discussed in Chapter 5), in addition to the fact that the greatest part of Karavela’s private archive was destroyed in a fire that broke out in her studio in 1996, contributed to the artist’s presence not being recorded as an essential attribute of the work.

Art historian Stelios Lydakis noted that Karavela succeeded in immersing visitors in her work and ‘surrounding them’ with its message.\(^ {100}\) As Karavela herself notes in an interview about the Astor exhibition, the ‘message’ had to be apparent and anchored in reality. Regarding the ephemerality of her work, Karavela stated that ‘I am not at all concerned about the destruction of the artwork. It has carried out or failed to carry out its purpose in a given time, and afterwards it may live on as a memory in photographs or in film’.\(^ {101}\) Overall, Karavela’s environments were not assembled with the objective of offering aesthetic pleasure, nor were

---

\(^ {97}\) Xydis, 1981, 21.

\(^ {98}\) The information was given to me by the artist Mary Zygouri during an interview (2010). Zygouri had spoken with one of the viewers of the performance who revealed to her that Karavela was present.

\(^ {99}\) Alekos Kontopoulos, ‘Ἀπόψε Έκθεση Χώρου της Μαρίας Καραβέλα’ [Maria Karavela’s ‘Environment’ Tonight], Ta Nέα [The News] (10/51971).

\(^ {100}\) Stelios Lydakis. 1970. ‘Εξτρεμιστικό Έκθεμα’ [Extremist Spectacle], To Βήμα [The Podium] found in Moutsopoulos (ed.), 2006, 197.

\(^ {101}\) Maria Karavela. 1970. ‘Έκθεση Χώρου της Μαρίας Καραβέλα’ [Maria Karavela’s ‘Environment’], Interview in To Vima, found in Moutsopoulos (ed.), 2006, 196.
they intended to exist forever, sheltered under a museum’s roof; her main consideration was whether or not she succeeded in making her political messages immediately available to the public. However, the above quotation also reveals her interest in preserving some record of the work.

A few months later, in May 1971, Karavela presented a similar performative environment at the Athens Art Gallery at the Hilton. This work referred directly to the political prisoners of the military regime. The new environment was a symbolic but stifling representation of prison, and Karavela’s message was even more poignant this time. In order to divide the inner space of the gallery and create paths for the visitors, she built brick walls. In each of the partitioned spaces, visitors would come across installations with unambiguous references to incarceration. A cell, an interrogator’s chair, a humble supper on the floor, slogans and words such as ‘help’ and ‘freedom’ written in red paint on the walls and floor and the sounds of screams and groans all contributed to the creation of an unbearable atmosphere of generalised confinement.102 Xydis remarked at the time that the feeling was so intense and the incitement to protest so obvious that the installation was closed down by the police within three days.103

103 Xydis, 1975, 192.
Evidently, Karavela expended a great deal of effort in generating ambient conditions under which viewers would be compelled to engage in a conceptual participation that nonetheless presupposed their live presence. Lydakis notes that, in the Hilton piece, carefully arranged lighting, in conjunction with the sounds used in the installation, ‘strengthened the dynamics of the strange atmosphere within which one is cleansed and sanctified by a profound feeling of compassion and fear.’

Both the Astor and Hilton environments had immediate and widespread impact on their viewers. Due to the expressive eloquence and straightforward nature of the Hilton work the artist was forced to flee to Paris to avoid persecution; this occurred after a ‘warning’ was sent by the police in the form of the forced termination of the Hilton show. Along with the closure of her exhibition, Karavela also lost her post at Athens’ National Technical University, as the military regime declared her artistic activities illegal. In Paris, Karavela continued to work and study as a political exile. In 1974, after the overthrow of the military regime, she returned to Greece and worked on projects that took place in public squares and were realised through the participation and collaboration of several people.

One of the first artists to introduce performativity to the Greek art scene and to invite viewers to involve themselves in a more active role in artistic works was Theodoros (Papadimitriou),

---

104 Lydakis, 1971.
106 The intense political character of her work, along with her personal struggle resistance, deprived her of the choice to return to Greece during the dictatorship.
who is widely known by his first name and worked mainly as a sculptor. In 1970, Theodoros began work on his project *Manipulations*, which consisted of a series of installations and performances, some of which are examined in this chapter. While such works have again been described as environments by Greek art historians, they were, in fact, the precursors of the actions and ‘anti-actions’ that immediately followed. This was also the time when an object that the artist referred to as a ‘matraque-phallus’ took centre stage in his work. The object was originally constructed by the artist in 1965, and it featured in his sculpture *Midnight Alarm*, which was exhibited just after the July Days (*Iouliana*, 1965) and the assassination of Sotiris Petroulas.107 *Matraque* is the French word for the clubs used by the French riot police to disperse protesters. Theodoros’s interest in the matraque-phallus was, at first, anthropological: The club was the first tool used by primitive man, the first medium of communication, attack and defence. The artist invented and used the matraque-phallus not only as a symbol of and instrument for communication and creation, but also oppression and violence.108

The first performative environment of the *Manipulations* unit had the self-contradictory, or at least ambiguous, title *Sculpture for Public Participation—Participation Prohibited* and was presented at the Studio of Contemporary Art at the Goethe Institute in Athens. A set of objects was lined up before the audience: three metal helmets, one of which was crushed, a number of small balls, compact metal cubes and a small iron cage that contained a similar small ball. The work also featured hearts made of various materials, with some intact and others broken. The matraque’s presence was dominant: standing up and covered by a long transparent length of plastic, it was placed next to the broken helmet, posed to smash one of the hearts.109 It was easy to draw connections between the exhibit and the political situation at the time: the helmets were evocative of the military, the iron cage suggested prison cells and the matraque could be viewed as a phallic symbol of fascism, capitalism and patriarchy, all of which enjoyed great support from the Junta.

---

108 Theodoros, Interview by the author, 14-15/7/2010. The interrelationship between violence and creation has been a key element and major theme throughout the artist’s work.
109 Theodoros, Interview by the author, 14-15/7/2010.
Apart from the sculptural objects being used as symbols of oppression, violence and power, the work also featured the artist’s presence, both through the medium of performative photography and a manifesto that reflected his critical views on the possibly embedded narcissism of artists and the (im)possibility of contemporary art acting as an agent of social and/or political change.\textsuperscript{110} Irony and self-sarcasm are used here by the artist as means to articulate his criticism:

\begin{quote}
In 1976, in her influential theorisation of video art, Rosalind Krauss used the popularity of video works featuring monologues addressing directly the camera to call the aesthetics of video one of ‘narcissism’. See Rosalind Krauss, ‘Video: The Aesthetics of Narcissism’, \textit{October}, vol.1, Spring 1976, 50-64.
\end{quote}
IS ART SOMETHING MORE THAN A SELFCOMPLACEMENT ACT?

SCULPTURE FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
PARTICIPATION PROHIBITED

I belong to those who still believe that consciousness is a motive power; if it is not a wart, we must get rid of in order to survive, that is, to conform to the available environment. If I were allowed the chance to choose between mercy and rage, I would choose rage. But good intentions alone cannot justify works of art. That is why, for some time now, I have racked my brains to find a solution to the following calculation: In terms of efficiency and with regard to good intentions, HOW MANY WORKS OF ART EQUAL A TANK when works of art and tanks belong to the means that create a cultural environment?

Sculpture as an Act of Internal and External Use

As works of sculpture do not belong only to the space of intellect but also to the physical space—the space where the hand is a unit of measurement, the space of objects—I think it is necessary that they are accompanied by instructions for their use (for every eventuality).

INSTRUCTIONS
A. General Instructions

SCULPTURE FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
PARTICIPATION PROHIBITED
DO NOT TOUCH THE WORKS OF ART
because

a. They are destined for museums and collections, places where DURATION, the prefabricated eternity of art, is confirmed and ensured.
b. The works of art are for sale—they are merchandise, luxury consumer goods—do not destroy them, do not harm the artist! (pity).

B. Special instructions for internal and external use are offered with every work of art when sold...

Manifesto, October 1970

Figure 1.6: Theodoros, Sculpture for Public Participation - Participation Prohibited, 1970, Goethe Institute, Athens

While, in Western histories of art, performances that have staged for the camera have been broadly considered as being documented performances, Theodoros’s use of performative photography as part of the installation in 1970 led Greek histories of art to discount the performative element of this artwork. The use of performative and textual elements in visual art at the time subverted art’s identification with objects intended to be preserved, protected and classified in museums and/or private collections. The artist questioned the role of art institutions that functioned merely as exhibition spaces, in which works of art are isolated from everyday life and placed on pedestals where they might be seen and admired, but not touched. The conception of a work of art as a luxury consumer product imposes the no-touch condition, allowing only its future owner to make such contact. Participation then becomes an ambiguous concept: Visitors are invited to participate in the process of viewing the work, but they can only do so under specific conditions that have legal consequences if violated.

In the 1970s, with the country in the grip of the Junta, this work was interpreted as an act of resistance, and it thus became the target of intense criticism, insults and harsh comments. The press, which was controlled by the regime, attacked the work directly. In an unsigned article

entitled ‘How “Art” Turns Into Subversion and Politics’, published in the monthly paper *4th of August*, the writer criticised not only the artist and his work but the audience as well. In his/her own words, ‘[…] the entire masochistic intelligentsia of the so-called intellectual circles of the supposedly educated class of whiskey drinkers—ouzo is too vulgar a drink for them—and marijuana users, together with the entire Athenian communist subculture, rejoiced, making Theodoros’s “sculptural” exhibition a “triumph”’.\(^{112}\)

However, this specific work goes beyond a merely anti-dictatorial reading, indicating a general—and for many, shocking—connection between fascism and capitalism. Such a connection is perhaps even more overt in a 1973 performance set in New York, in which Theodoros roams the streets of the city, holding the matraque-phallus. His walk leads him to the Twin Towers of the Trade Centre for a ‘confrontation’ with the phallic symbols of capitalism. In this route-intervention in public space, the audience is random. Only a cameraman follows the artist every step of the way, recording the performance so that the recording will later become the medium of communication. The phallic towers, the destruction of which in 2001 was perhaps the greatest ‘spectacle’ of the decade, functioned as a visible representation of capitalism’s power.

---

European Marxist intellectuals of an anti-capitalist disposition have been consistently preoccupied with the link between fascism and capitalism. Already in 1934, Bertolt Brecht noted that anyone who wishes to tell the truth about fascism must also be willing to speak out against capitalism, maintaining that

Fascism is a historic phase of capitalism; in this sense it is something new and at the same time old. In fascist countries capitalism continues to exist, but only in the form of fascism; and fascism can be combated as capitalism alone, as the nakedest, most shameless, most oppressive and most treacherous form of capitalism.\(^{113}\)

A more sustained analysis of fascism’s interrelation with capitalism was conducted by political sociologist Nicos Poulantzas in his seminal 1970 study *Fascism and Dictatorship*, in which he argues that fascism is born out of capitalism and grows within, and cannot be dissociated, from capitalist-imperialist ideology. Poulantzas, following Gramsci, emphasises the role of the state as both an ideological and repressive apparatus, explaining the success of fascism as being a product of working-class defeat and arguing that the fascist state is a specific form of exceptional state. His analysis refers not only to fascism but also to ‘fascist ideology’, the characteristic features of which correspond utterly to the interests of big capital. Poulantzas therefore associates fascist ideology with imperialist and petty-bourgeois ideology by identifying their shared characteristics, which are consistently presented in ‘anti-capitalist’ guises: ‘statetolatry’, anti-judicialism, elitism, anti-Semitism/racism, nationalism, militarism, anticlericalism, the importance placed on the role of the family, the role of education, obscurantism and anti-intellectualism and, finally, corporatism.\(^{114}\)

Theodoros’s work arguably transcends interpretation solely in light of the Greek dictatorship or even historical fascism, as it critiques the conformity of bourgeois society and ‘the fascism in us all, in our heads and in our everyday behaviour, the fascism that causes us to love power, to desire the very thing that dominates and exploits us’, as Michel Foucault put it in the preface of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s *Anti-Oedipus*.\(^{115}\) Art historian and curator

---


\(^{115}\) Michel Foucault. 2011 [1972], ‘Preface’ in Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Pierre-Félix [Translated from the French by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane]. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Continuum), xiv-xv.
Denys Zacharopoulos has aptly associated Theodoros’s works with man’s desire for power, suggesting that they ‘deal directly with the object of desire, that is, man himself, reduced to the state of an object. For desire for an object is not only sexual in nature; it is primarily lust for power and dominance, a desire for appropriation and assimilation, for imposition and survival’. Desire, according to Deleuze and Guattari, does not arise from lack, as Jacques Lacan postulated; rather, being socially produced, it is a productive force in and of itself:

Desire is never separable from complex assemblages that necessarily tie into molecular levels, from microformations already shaping postures, attitudes, perceptions, expectations, semiotic systems, etc. Desire is never an undifferentiated instinctual energy, but itself results from a highly developed, engineered setup rich in interactions: a whole supple segmentarity that processes molecular energies and potentially gives desire a fascist determination.

Although Deleuze and Guattari maintain that fascism invented the concept of the totalitarian state, they also distinguish between totalitarian and fascist states, as the former imposes order and oppression from above through force (i.e. legislative power, police action and/or military regimes), while the latter produces repression and order on the ‘molecular’ levels of family, couples, cities, neighbourhoods, schools, offices, etc., sparing no one and penetrating every cell of society: ‘What makes fascism dangerous is its molecular or micropolitical power, for it is a mass movement: a cancerous body rather than a totalitarian organism’. As the authors explain, and as both Theodoros and Dimitris Alithinos’s works (which are examined next) suggest, while it is easy ‘to be anti-fascist on the molar level’ and protest against the state, it is far more difficult to see the fascist inside us, the fascist we ‘sustain and nourish and cherish with molecules both personal and collective’, and become aware of our tendency to reiterate the repressive power of the state in our intimate relationships, behaviours, interactions and so forth.

---

118 Ibid., 214-215.
119 Ibid., 215.
Dimitris Alithinos was another artist who explored the function and limits of happenings and performance. One of his most significant works, titled *A Happening* [Ένα Συμβάν], took place in 1973, during the dictatorship, at the Ora Cultural Centre in Athens. This work involved people trapped in white boxes, out of which protruded moving limbs. In one corner, there was another box, inside of which acid dripped onto a piece of metal, slowly destroying it, while one last box had a tiny hole similar to a telescope’s eyepiece. Visitors to the show would spontaneously look through it and see themselves in a mirror. Passing through the boxes, visitors arrived at the familiar scene of a middle-class dining table.\textsuperscript{120} According to the artist’s original vision, he had intended to place a piece of meat, instead of the piece of metal, beneath the acid, an idea he had realised on the first day of the exhibition. He replaced the meat with the piece of metal because of the intense smell of burning flesh and the fire hazard it posed.\textsuperscript{121}

---


\textsuperscript{121} Alithinos Dimitris, Interview by the author, 17/10/2013.
The mutilated bodies invited comparison with the torture with which the fascistic government punished dissidents. The trapped bodies were interpreted by the audience as trapped subjectivities, deprived of human rights. The melting by acid, first of the meat and, later, of the metal, was a clear reference to the disintegration and erosion not only of the human body but also of the human identity, consciousness and substance. As mentioned earlier, it was only a minority of Greeks who attempted to fight the military regime. The ‘silent majority’ had settled comfortably within the state of oppression, accepting the political conditions without openly voicing reservations or expressing doubts. Alithinos forced his viewers to confront not only the regime of terror but their own complicity in it as well: The idea of peering into the box and facing not another image of horror but an image of themselves, which had the potential to generate an equally horrified reaction, can be associated with the juxtaposed orderly bourgeois family dining table, again drawing a link between fascism and capitalism. The performance had a drastic effect on the audience and provoked intense reactions. The gallery opened at 9 a.m., but people often gathered outside up to an hour earlier, while, after the exhibit closed, they would linger until midnight, having long discussions with the artist and each other. At first, Alithinos was also inside the boxes, but he eventually left the gallery to avoid being arrested, as he was certain that the police would shut down the exhibition at some point.¹²² In an article published in *Kathimerini*, Maria Karavia described the performance as emotionally overwhelming, as it created a truly intense atmosphere in which

---

¹²² Alithinos Dimitris, interview by the author, 17/10/2013.
people talked and cried. After a few days, as expected, a police officer barged into the gallery and accused the artist of ‘practicing horrible tortures’ during the exhibition.  

1.4 Confronting/Subverting Censorship and Engaging Audiences

One of the most important aspects of these performative environments and performances is their meaningful engagement of visitors. Public participation in such acts of resistance, even disguised ones, posed risks, as such participation constituted an offense and could lead to arrest. Public engagement and participation were therefore encouraged by the military regime and the censorship it imposed in two ways: On the one hand, art became a direct political action and began to attract an audience that was not necessarily interested in art itself; on the other hand, artists began to develop and employ a new language that focused on how political power inscribed itself on the body and the communicative potential of a work of art. As Michel Foucault argued in The History of Sexuality, censorship can bring about a discursive ferment that may eventually lead to a proliferation of discourses; expurgation of the authorised vocabulary give rises to ‘a veritable discursive explosion’, while ‘a whole rhetoric of allusion and metaphor’ is codified. Thus, censorship did not only interrupt communication, as it also functioned as an incentive for speech and taking action.

In her study of modern Greek poetry and the politics of censorship during the years of the dictatorship, literary theorist Karen Van Dyck stated that writers ‘tend[ed] to treat censorship as a system that opens up alternative modes of signification at the same time as it closes down more traditional ways’. Censorship is a process that reproduces ideological structures and simultaneously creates alternative methods of social interaction. Performance art emerged as a new process of communication as artists sought to introduce new conceptual structures into Greek art. Poet and critic Nasos Vagenas has also emphasised the productive dimension of censorship: ‘Censorship forces you to invent allusive ways to express yourself symbolically or allegorically…It can motivate subtle mechanisms for channeling meaning, it

126 Ibid., 27.
can function as a filter that distills the raw, realistic excitations brought on by repression, turning them into forms more artistically wrought in the long run more effective’. 

The dictator Georgios Papadopoulos wished to cultivate a mimetic relationship between what was said or written and what was meant; therefore, he ordered that all books bear titles that corresponded exactly to their contents, which suggests that he wished to avoid any kind of semantic instability. While he feared the allusive dimension of metaphor as subversive, he frequently used medical metaphors, comparing Greece to a patient that needed to be encased in plaster to heal. As Van Dyck remarks, Papadopoulos’s use of metaphor and his distrust of the dissidents’ use thereof were not contradictory but, instead, frighteningly consistent: Both were attempts to gain complete control over the social body and its modes of cultural expression.

In incorporating human figures encased in plaster in her environments, Karavela used Papadopoulos’s widely known metaphor to develop associations that were easy to decode in terms of their political message. In her first environment-performance, she enhanced her allegorical discourse with a metaphorical use of sacks and a ladder, while the second environment’s references to the regime were so obvious that they resulted in the abrupt termination of the exhibition by the authorities. Such police interference served as an indicator of the success of the exhibitions, as it showed that they were considered ‘dangerous’. This means that these shows potentially had an impact not only on the visitors but also on the Junta government, as they may have been seen as a possible locus of subversion. Karavela insisted that painting was not ‘enough’ to excite people. For her, a different approach was needed to deeply move audiences. The intrusion of the police in the exhibitions of both Karavela and Alithinos also signifies that their audiences were not homogeneous in terms of their political identities, since it was presumably individuals who had viewed these artists’ works who denounced them to the authorities. Alithinos noted that his exhibition’s visitors’ book included offensive comments from supporters of the regime, revealing the varied political opinions of members of the audience. Pierre Bourdieu has argued in *The Love of Art* that audiences are in fact homogeneous in terms of class. Yet class

---

129 Other artists, such as Vlassis Caniaris and Dimitris Alithinos, also used plaster in their works in reference to Papadopoulos’s speech.
130 Maria Karavela. 1971. “Έκθεση Περιβάλλοντος τη Δευτέρα στο Χίλτον” [Environment at Hilton on Monday], *To Βήμα* [The Podium] (8 May).
131 Dimitris Alithinos, Interview by the author, 17/10/2013.
cannot be identified with a political identity. The diversity of political identities was also evident in more recent performances. For instance, in Alexandros Plomaritis’s performance *Live your Myth in Greece* in 2012, in which the artist reads to the audience personal stories of immigrants and refugees who managed to arrive in Greece but experience constantly racial discrimination, the artist mentions that some people from the audience were members or supporters of the fascist political party Golden Dawn and they approached him to express their objections to the performance. There is therefore a complex issue here, a parameter that was dismissed in Bourdieu’s seminal research on art audiences. As is evident from the above examples, performance art in the 1970s constituted a space of resistance, and its success lay in promoting genuine, politically motivated public engagement.

### 2. Performing Violence

#### 2.1 The Years of ‘Metapolitefsi’ [The Post-Junta Period]

The second section of Chapter 1 provides some information regarding the socio-political developments that took place in Greece after the collapse of the military regime in 1974; it also examines the significance of the events of 1989 before proceeding to discuss the development of performance art in the 1980s and 1990s. Following his return from exile in 1974, Konstantinos Karamanlis formed the New Democracy party, advocating a middle course between left and right—although, in reality, it has always been a right-wing party—and promoting closer ties with Western Europe. The Pan-Hellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK), led by Andreas Papandreou, also emerged in 1974, while the Communist Party (KKE) was made legal for the first time since 1936. New Democracy won both the general elections of 1974 and 1977. In 1981, Greece joined the European Union and also elected its first socialist government. In a historic election, Papandreou's PASOK won 48% of the vote, thus commanding a clear parliamentary majority. The year 1981 defines thus the problematic embodiment of Greece in the hegemonic ideology of Western world and the process of Greek society’s adjustment to the social developments of Western European countries.

---

132 Interview with the artist (15/11/2014).
The 1980s were a controversial decade, during which Greek society experienced a profound transformation. Although some consider this period to be a golden decade, it is also seen by many as the origin of the political and economic turmoil of recent years. The 1980s were defined by a contradiction, as they were a decade defined by both socialist ideology and capitalist practices. The spirit of intense politicisation began to fade and was gradually replaced by consumerism, pop culture and mass entertainment. Lifestyle press and populism came to dominate, transforming Greece into an individualistic society governed by a democracy premised on atomisation. In 1989, the advent of private television altered the way in which public opinion was affected and introduced new protagonists to the public sphere. Despite the socialist government, clientelism and a political system rife with corruption and nepotism remained dominant, while, in terms of everyday life, society was gradually being ‘modernised’. Generally, it could be said that, in the 1980s, Greek society became dominated by a consumerist, hedonistic culture. The anti-Americanism of the 1970s (a result of the US foreign policy that led to the Greek Junta) dissipated, leaving room for the values of the American Dream to seep into Greek society.134

Greece is one of the countries that were significantly affected by the end of Cold War. Being geographically a passage to Europe for immigrants, the country underwent substantial demographic and socio-economic changes during the 1990s. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc between 1989 and the early 1990s, the immigrant inflow became massive and uncontrollable, while migration policy has remained ineffective. Traditionally, Greece was always a migrant-exporting country; the fact that, suddenly, in the early 1990s, it became a migrant-importing country caught the government (and society as a whole) off guard. Greek society faced a number of challenges, ranging from xenophobia and racism to the social exclusion of immigrants to a turn to the extreme right on the part of Greek citizens. Greek immigration policy was haphazard and failed to integrate immigrants in the economic and social fabric of the country. Thus, such large-scale immigration within such a short period of time had significant social and economic consequences. The influx of migrants seems to have directly affected the nation’s economic output and unemployment rate; in addition, it has had a more complex impact on growth rates, trade relations and the balance of

payments and the demands for education, health services and social infrastructure, as well as on the political, social and cultural conditions of the country.\textsuperscript{135}

In the late 1990s, the most pressing issue—as presented to the Greek public—was the affiliation of Greece to the European Economic and Monetary Union and the adoption of the Euro.\textsuperscript{136} This was consistent with the process of internationalisation experienced in Greece during the last quarter of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. The matter of the Europeanisation of Greece was of major importance during the 1990s, when the term became synonymous with modernisation. Greece was ultimately accepted into the Economic and Monetary Union of the European Union by the European Council in 2000 and adopted the euro as its currency, replacing the drachma, in 2001.\textsuperscript{137}

\textit{2.2 The Performances}

After the end of the dictatorship, and likely due to the physical and psychological violence that dissidents and rebels had suffered, artists became themselves more ‘violent’ in the production of their performances. In 1979, Karavela, in collaboration with the Kokkinia municipality, organised a project under the title of \textit{Makronissos and the Block}, to be performed at Kokkinia’s central square.\textsuperscript{138} Kokkinia was—and remains—an impoverished working-class neighbourhood near the port of Pireaus in Athens, mostly inhabited by descendants of the displaced refugees of Greek origin who reached Athens in 1922, after the Asia Minor catastrophe.\textsuperscript{139} The Block of Kokkinia (the Raid of Kokkinia), commonly known in English-speaking literature as ‘the Tragedy of Kokkinia’, refers to a Nazi mass execution of at least 350 civilians, all of whom were males aged between 14 and 60; thousands more were sent to camps in Hitler’s Germany. This was the Nazis’ reprisal for the Battle of Kokkinia five months earlier, where the communist National Liberation Front (EAM) had

\textsuperscript{136} Voulgaris, 14-15.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 168-169.
\textsuperscript{138} Makronisos is a Greek island that has been used as a prison island until the restoration of democracy after the fall of the Junta in 1974.
\textsuperscript{139} For further information, see Christos Patragas. 2004. \textit{Μεγάλο Πειραιάκο Λεύκωμα} [Great Album of Pireaus] (Mytilenaios).
fought together with the people of Kokkinia against the Nazis and their Greek collaborators, the Gendarmerie and paramilitary troops.\[^{140}\]

The artist refers to this work as ‘synthetic art’, meaning an artwork that encompasses a wide range of artistic media, including video projections, installations and the participation of fifteen residents of Kokkinia (who were neither artists nor actors). She also used parts of a film she made in 1977, called *Resistance '40-’50*.\[^{141}\] The film consisted of interviews with partisans or members of their families regarding the events that took place between 1940 and 1950. The 1940s were one of the most devastating decades in Greek history. The horrors of foreign military occupation by Italian and German forces were combined with the ravages that the Greek Civil War (1946-1949) had wrought. The Civil War was the result of a highly polarised struggle between left and right ideologies that began in 1943. The struggle became one of the first conflicts of the Cold War (1947-1991) and represents the first example of the Cold War powers becoming involved in the internal politics of a foreign country after World War II. Historians of the 21rst century have argued that there are two mythic versions of the events of this specific decade, namely the account of the winners and that of the losers, both of which are influenced by ideological factors. These two polar positions are characterised by idealisation and demonisation. The prevailing version has been (as usual) that of the winners, according to which the EAM was simply a cover for the communists to seize power.\[^{142}\]

Because of its political content, which argued against the prevailing version of history, Karavela’s film was banned by the Greek government. After the controversy was recorded in the press, the State Presidency allowed the public projection of the film, provided that it was re-edited so that specific sections of the interviews with people recounting their experiences would be omitted. Karavela refused to comply, and the ensuing controversy received even greater press coverage. Finally, the government ordered the film to be withdrawn. Karavela had arranged to collaborate with seventeen Athenian municipalities on the production of similar participatory projects. These were all were cancelled, with the exception of the


Figure 1.12: Maria Karavela, *Makronissos and the Block*, 1979, Participatory Project, Kokkinia.

The publicity the event received through the press drew a great number of people to the square to watch and participate in this new form of live art—what has been called, in art’s more recent post-1989 social turn, ‘re-enactment’. The central intention of the project was to revive the narratives of National Resistance that existed during the Nazi occupation and the Greek Civil War not only through slide projections, film, music, songs, theatre and happenings but also the active involvement of the public. The live oral narratives of Kokkinia residents were juxtaposed with filmed interviews. Actors re-enacted the communist soldiers relinquishing their arms after the Treaty of Varkiza, which signalled the end of the Civil War. Among the participants, the elderly women of Kokkinia recounted how they had lost their
children during the Nazi occupation. A male resident talked about the life and death of Aris Velouchiotis (1905-1945), the legendary communist leader of the Greek People’s Liberation Army [ΕΛΑΣ], fighting against the Nazis. Symbolic acts, such as bringing clothes stained with blood to the mourning mothers, brought the drama to its climax.\textsuperscript{144} In Karavela’s words, the intention of the Kokkinia re-enactment was to bridge the gaps between the artist, the specialist and the public; in other words, she intended to achieve the demystification of art and the participation of people in the creative process, reflecting the ways in which diverse groups contribute to the processes of organised social life.\textsuperscript{145}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Maria Karavela, \textit{Makronissos and the Block}, 1979, Participatory Project, Kokkinia.}
\end{figure}

At the time, it was very difficult for art critics not only to place such a project within a theoretical discourse—and, anyway, the existence of such discourses in Greece was extremely limited at the time—but also to evaluate it: Was it a political or an artistic event? Should it be assessed on the grounds of its political narrative and intention or, as the hegemonic formalist art criticism of the times would have it, on the grounds of the ‘mixed media’ aesthetic it was premised on? The art critics’ confusion resulted in Veatriki Spiliadi arguing—in reference to

\begin{thebibliography}{145}
\item Maria Karavela, ‘Έκθεση Χώρου στην Κόρινθο’ [Environment in Korinthos], \textit{Ta Nέa} [The News] (2/10/1975).
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the similar projects entitled *Cyprus* and *Dachau* that Karavela had performed in 1975 in Korinthos—that such artistic efforts had a ‘missionary’ character, as they presupposed great courage, sacrifice and extreme dedication. She referred to the work as an ‘exhibition of space’ and emphasised the importance and novelty of the attempt to unite a public space, the people and the installations into one entity, which would be the work of art. In a later article, Spiliadi refers to the projects *Cyprus* and *Dachau* as being more akin to theatrical performances than the visual arts. According to her, the event was reminiscent of the plebeian forms of theatre that took place in the squares of Europe during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance in front of audiences that participated backstage by contributing to the preparation of the performance. Nevertheless, she noted the complexity of the project and its combination of different forms of art, including theatre, cinema, photography, sound and written speech. For Spiliadi, the attempt to perform an artistic event outdoors, in spaces of social life, undermined the view of art as being addressed exclusively to the bourgeoisie and art specialists. Finally, she stressed that the most important element of such an effort was the lack of any sort of commercial ulterior motive. In an article on *Makronissos and the Block*, art historian Eleni Varopoulou commented that the project had the character of a political action, and she stressed the emotional involvement of the public. She also raised some ethical questions regarding the ‘use’ of the elderly women by the artist to achieve political or artistic aims and asked whether an artist should be allowed to provoke psychological pain and whether the women were fully aware of what would happen during the event. On the other hand, Spiliadi, using ethics to evaluate an art project long before the debate on ethics emerged in the contemporary art scene, attributed ‘purity’ to Karavela’s *Cyprus* and *Dachau*. She also praised the project’s anti-commercial character and regarded the charge that the artist took advantage of the participants as unjustified since she did not have financial gain—i.e. she did not receive a fee for her work, and the work itself could not be sold. For Varopoulou, the issue of the artist’s remuneration is beside the point, as she more or less accuses Karavela of the psychological rape of the elderly women involved in this work. Evidently, Karavela’s
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146 Veatriki Spiliadi. 1975. Έκθεση Χώρου Μαρίας Καραβέλα στην Κόρινθο’ [Maria Karavela’s Artistic Environment in Korinthos], Καθημερινή [Kathimerini] (30 September).
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work, given that it encompassed performative elements and required the public’s active contribution, raised issues that were to become central in the turn to a participatory art paradigm decades later.

A number of articles and essays have been written by art theorists outside of Greece regarding the issue of using ethics as a tool of art evaluation. As Anna Dezeuze has argued, spectator participation ‘is always caught up between two opposing threats: the risk of being used as a superficial gimmick, and that of being invested with unattainable hopes of social change or personal transformation’. Before accusing Karavela of exploitation, one should consider some other parameters of such projects, such as their contributions to political discussion, their innovative character and the significance of intense audience engagement. Karavela created open platforms that provided venues for political speech and enabled the discussion of subjects that had remained unspoken of for a great number of years, such as the Civil War. Let us not forget that, despite the formally restored democracy, the right-wing government of the country censored Karvela’s film about the Resistance Movement because it dared to present the ‘other point of view’ and give voice to communists.

Nowadays, such a project could be described as participatory, relational, dialogical or as a form of community-based art. Yet the production of human relations—as in Nicolas Bourriaud’s 1990 take on ‘relational aesthetics’—was not the aim of, nor the process employed in, Karavela’s project: The participants drawn from the residents of Korinthos and Kokkinia already knew each other. In Kokkinia, they shared both a class and a historical identity. ‘Meaning’ was not something to be produced collectively here, as was the case in Karavela’s gallery-based environments. The banned film included a collection of documented narratives on well-known events, of which the elderly women of Kokkinia represented the living memories. Karavela’s historical re-enactment bears resemblances to Jeremy Deller’s re-enactment of the miners’ conflict with the Thatcher police *The Battle of Orgreave* realised in 2001. Deller, with the assistance of historian Howard Giles, spent a year visiting the town of Orgreave in Britain and used a variety of research methods, as Karavela had also done, to investigate the events. Although the two re-enactments set the focus on different issues, labour relations and conflict in the case of Deller, fascism, occupation, the civil war and censorship in the case of Karavela, both projects reclaim the public space to negotiate both the individual and collective memory of the events of the past drawing into the reconstruction of
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the events social groups that are not the usual art audiences, the local communities of Orgreave and Kokkinia respectively.\textsuperscript{151} The artists’ effort to reach audiences of lower classes outside the usual art institutions has been a continuous aim of performance art and is further discussed in Chapter 5.

Some years later, in 1985 (the 1980s were a charged decade in Greece, to which people still have divided views, as mentioned previously), Karavela presented a performance that dealt with the issues of not only political but also biopolitical violence, since the mechanisms of oppression she denounced this time were not implemented and practised by a fascist regime but, instead, by a democratic one. This performance took place at the Desmos Gallery in Athens. This time, the distinction between the artist and audience was clear: Karavela was on stage performing, and the spectators watched. She had warned the readers of \textit{Eleftherotypia}, a major national press paper, that her new work was ‘cruel’, and it was up to them whether they wished to witness it or not. She asked the public to bring white flowers, which she intended to use in the performance.\textsuperscript{152}

The artist read a text entitled ‘Insulting the Public’, which denounced the bourgeois mode of life. Her voice and movements were intense, almost violent. Suddenly, the lights were switched off, and the artist, often referred to as an ‘actress’ in the national press, pretended to crush a small chicken with a brick and covered her face and clothes with ‘blood’. At the same time, a projection showed brutal images of human misery, such as photographs of children and adults dying of hunger, accompanied by deafening music. She then pretended to eat dirt; thereafter, she released some mice into the space, scaring the audience, but pulled them back quickly with the threads she had tied to their feet. Finally, roses were thrown at the viewers, and the lights were again switched on.

The performance was described as a ‘spectacle’ in \textit{Kathimerini}, a right-wing, yet respected, newspaper that was sold widely. The \textit{Kathimerini} review depicted the performance as experimental work of theatre that combined audiovisual elements, gesture and pantomime, with the intention ‘to shock’.\textsuperscript{153} There is little doubt that Karavela’s aim was indeed to


\textsuperscript{152} Socrates Tsichlias. 1985. ‘Θέαμα από τη Μαρία Καραβέλα Απόψε και Αύριο στο Δεσμό’ [A Spectacle by Maria Karavela Tonight and Tomorrow at Desmos], \textit{Καθημερινή} [Kathimerini] (23 February).

\textsuperscript{153}Ibid.
awaken her viewers from the insensitivity and passivity of their bourgeois complacency. ‘The spectacle will be hard’, she had noted, and its objective was not to please but to discomfit.\footnote{154}

Almost a decade earlier, in 1976, a couple of years after the fall of the dictatorship, Theodoros had also presented (twice) a performance imbued with violence at the Experimental Theatre in Athens. In *Manipulation II – On the Limits of Tolerance*, the artist investigates the relationship between violence and culture, and the tolerance of the audience. Theodoros initially addressed his audience, asking them to reflect on the borders separating culture and violence. The performance ended with the sacrifice of a guinea pig in the name of art. In the first performance, the audience intervened and prevented the killing while in the second performance, the artist did kill the animal before the viewers, provoking disgust.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image1.png}
\caption{Theodoros, *Manipulation II – On the Limits of Tolerance*, 1976, Performance, Experimental Theatre, Athens.}
\end{figure}

\footnote{154} Ibid.
On the other hand, there have also been examples (fewer, admittedly) of performances that did not relate to political protest or that did not feature any political statements and intentions. The artistic duo Titsa Grekou and Nikos Zouboulis, for instance, were engaged with performance since 1976 (Zouboulis himself produced a number of happenings, starting in 1973) through a different approach to the one examined in the chapter. The artists used white latex/elastic sheets framed in a crate to instantly mould images of their moving bodies, creating ephemeral ‘sculptural’ reliefs as hybrids of performance and sculpture. This practice became the trademark of their collaborative work, and it was repeated several times through the years; such repetition is rarely observed in the work of Greek performance artists. In some cases, they invited viewers to participate by experimenting with the latex themselves. The artists would then photograph the participating audience members and offer them the photographs. During the 1980s, they also used plaster to capture their actions, thus producing sculptural objects. Performances were usually accompanied by music—often in co-operation with the musicians Thodoros Antoniou and Guther Becker—while the play of light and shadow intensified the sense of the theatrical. When compared to the artists discussed previously, Grekou and Zouboulis had a different approach to performance art; they did not intend to reject an object-based approach to art but rather wished to explore the ways in which the body may function during the process of making art. Their performances could be seen as another method of approaching form, rather than an attempt to engage with social and political life. In their work, the body was used as a medium for exploring matter and space.

The 1980s and 1990s were decades during which Greek artists continued to explore performance. As mentioned in the introduction, the *Environment-Action* exhibition in 1981 can be considered as signalling the recognition of performance art as a distinct genre. However, a great many performances took place in public locations during the 1980s and 1990s, outside of institutional spaces, and have remained completely unrecorded and consequently unknown. The second chapter of this thesis sheds light on those performative practices that oscillate between life and art. Moreover, female artists, such as Leda Papaconstantinou and Niki Kanagini, were responsible for a number of performances during these decades; this shifts the focus of this dissertation to gender issues, as discussed in Chapter 3.

Figure 1.15: Nikos Zouboulis-Titsa Grekou, *Untitled*, 1981, Sculpture Diptych.
3. From Post-Dictatorship to Post-Democracy, or, Performance as Collective Trauma

3.1 Debt Crisis, Debt Society and the Indebted Man.

By the end of 2009, as a result of a combination of both international and local factors, the Greek economy faced its most severe crisis since the restoration of democracy in 1974. In the years that followed, Greek society underwent—and is still undergoing—immense changes, not only in its political and economic fabric but in all aspects of everyday life. Human, labour and social rights, gained after decades of struggle, have been attacked and/or abolished through legislation passed through extraordinary procedures, often in disregard of the democratic process. This was done in the name of ‘rescuing’ the country, under the pretence that there was ‘no alternative’, once again endangering the rule of democracy. The Greek government’s management of the crisis, which involved the constant erosion of popular sovereignty and the devaluation of human life (through laws connected to austerity and dictated by the representatives of the so-called Troika), are evidence of the existence of a post-democratic state. As political scientist Colin Crouch has noted, ‘the entire way in which the crisis has been managed has been evidence of a further drift towards post-democracy’.156

‘Post-democracy’ is a term coined by Colin Crouch in 2000 in his book Coping with Post-Democracy. It has also been used by Jacques Rancière and Chantal Mouffe to describe a society where while all the institutions of democracy are used, a small elite in control use the democratic system in their favour. In post-democracy, voters can chose a political party but in reality there is little or no difference between them as they all employ neoliberal policies.157 In the words of Yannis Stavrakakis, the term postdemocracy ‘emerged in sociology and political theory as part of an effort to conceptually grasp and critically mark the late modern pathologies of liberal democracy, especially in relation to late capitalist conditions’.158 The concept of post-democracy is inextricably connected to neoliberalism, which, as David Harvey explains, ‘has become hegemonic as a mode of discourse, and has pervasive effects
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on ways of thought and political-economic practices to the point where it has become incorporated into the common-sense way we interpret, live in and understand the world’. 159

3.2 The Debt Crisis, Debt Society and the Indebted Man

The debt crisis that has dominated Greek politics and policy since 2010 is part of the on-going Eurozone crisis, itself a product of the onset of the global economic recession in October 2008. The Greek crisis is believed to have been caused by a combination of the structural weaknesses of the nation’s economy with structural deficits that had existed for decades prior. In mid-2010, following the revelation that, in 2009, the fiscal deficit of Greece had reached levels that made its debt unsustainable, the Greek government found that it was unable to borrow from the markets to finance the current government deficit and debt at reasonable rates. The result, as portrayed by the mass media, was an imminent threat of the suspension of payments by the Greek government. The government attempted to restore the country’s credibility in international markets and achieve a reduction of interest rates by taking measures to reduce costs. These austerity policies, however, not only failed to reverse the negative climate but also promoted social injustice and led to violations of human rights. Greece resorted to the ‘help’ of the International Monetary Fund, the European Commission and the European Central Bank, which formed a joint aid mechanism for Greece, called the Troika. The announcement of the appeal for support was issued on the 23rd of April 2010 by Prime Minister George Papandreou (the son of Andreas Papandreou), who chose an ‘ingenious’ way to dress up bad news: He appeared on TV on the island of Kastelorizo, before the backdrop of the shimmering blue Aegean. The image could have been a harbinger of the country’s sorry state: Greece’s creditors have been attempting to achieve the sale of national assets, coming very close to success in the summer of 2015.

Financing by means of the support mechanism was agreed under the condition that Greece would undertake fiscal adjustments and, in particular, fiscal consolidation measures. Papandreou’s government, with the propagandistic support of the mass media, attempted to convince the Greek people that the financial assistance provided by the support mechanism would avert the immediate danger of the suspension of payments, which would likely have uncontrollable consequences for the entire Eurozone. The first measures were announced by

159 David Harvey. 2006. ‘Neo-liberalism as Creative Destruction’, Geografiska Annaler, 88/2, 145.
the Prime Minister on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} of May 2010. The Greek economy continued to exist in a state of fiscal imbalance, and, a year later, in June 2011, the government resorted to the adoption of the Medium-Term Fiscal Strategy programme, which included new austerity measures and cuts. Along with the new measures, the government began discussing selling parts of the public domain. Multiple demonstrations and general strikes took place across Greece in response. The protests began on the 5\textsuperscript{th} of May 2010 with a riot, one of the largest in Greece since 1973. On the 25\textsuperscript{th} of May 2011, anti-austerity protestors organised by the Direct Democracy Now! Movement, also known as the Indignant Citizens Movement [\textit{Kinima Aganaktismenon Politon}], started demonstrating in major cities across Greece by occupying central squares. The square sit-in demonstrations officially ended when police started removing the demonstrators in August 2011. However, in effect, the wave of Greek riots had already begun on the 6\textsuperscript{th} of December 2008, after the cold-blooded killing of Alexandros Grigoropoulos, a 15-year-old student, by a police officer in the Exarcheia district of central Athens.\textsuperscript{160} The protests against police brutality spread not only across the majority of Greek cities but also beyond the country’s borders: over two hundred solidarity actions took place around the world. During the riots that followed Grigoropoulos’s death, police departments, banks, government ministries, and other public buildings in Athens came under almost daily attack, while universities, high schools, town halls, and other buildings across the country were occupied by demonstrators. This major insurrection, which was indicative of the mounting pressures in Greek society, attracted a great deal of attention from social justice movements globally.\textsuperscript{161} While the unrest was triggered by a specific incident of police brutality, the media, theorists and scholars have examined the deeper causes of the reactions and analysed the widespread feelings of frustration in the younger generation regarding the economic problems of the country, the rising unemployment rate among young people and the general inefficiency of and corruption in Greek state institutions.\textsuperscript{162}

Since then, Greek society has experienced radical changes. The so-called economic crisis has clearly become—or was, originally—a political crisis, which, within a very short period of time, came to jeopardise the democratic regime. Papandreou’s government promoted an

\textsuperscript{160} \textquoteleft Riots in Greece, Anarchy in Athens’, \textit{The Economist}, \url{http://www.economist.com/node/12756043} [accessed 23/3/2011].


\textsuperscript{162} See for instance, Antonis Vradis and Dimitris Dalakoglou (eds). 2011. \textit{Revolt and Crisis in Greece: Between a Present yet to Pass and a Future Still to Come}. 
authoritarian approach to democracy by using blackmail tactics and eliminating any other alternative: Either we vote for the Medium-Term Strategy or we go bankrupt. Parliament ratified the legislation concerning the Medium-Term Fiscal Strategy programme not by following regular parliamentary procedures but after an urgent debate, a fact that indicates a clear authoritarian turn in its operation. In addition, by the time the law was passed, the police had been ordered to evacuate Syntagma Square, which was occupied by diverse groups of citizens protesting the measures imposed by the government and the EU/IMF. The subsequent violent attack by the riot police on the protesters, which included extensive use of tear-gas and physical abuse, was inevitable. Accusations of police brutality were reported by the international media, including the BBC, The Guardian, CNN iReport and The New York Times, as well as Amnesty International. After PASOK lost its majority in Parliament, Prime Minister George Papandreou offered to resign and allow a provisional, unelected coalition government to deal with the major political turmoil. In November 2011, Lucas Papademos, a Greek economist and former Governor of the Bank of Greece, formed a government consisting of PASOK and New Democracy, with the support of the far-right Popular Orthodox Rally. It was the first time that the far right had appeared in the Greek government since the fall of the Junta in 1974.

A general election was held on the 6th of May 2012, but the Greek parties were unable to form a government. While New Democracy won, its rates had dropped significantly. The governing party PASOK collapsed, while radical left and far-right parties increased their rates. No party won a majority of parliamentary seats, and a new election was called for the 17th of June 2012, while Panagiotis Pikrammenos was appointed as the Prime Minister of a caretaker government. New Democracy came out on top and in a stronger position with 129 seats, compared to 108 in the May election. On the 20th of June 2012, Antonis Samaras, the president of New Democracy, successfully formed a coalition with PASOK and DIMAR (a newcomer to the centre-left scene that was not to last long). Before the elections, when New
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Amnesty International. 2011. ‘Tear gas fires as Greek police clash with Athens protesters’ (29 June) [accessed 14/6/2013].
Democracy was the opposition party, Samaras stated (using an interesting choice of words reminiscent of Papadopoulos’s metaphors) that ‘the medicine Greece has been given doesn’t work, the austerity measures aren’t working; the sacrifices that are being made aren’t paying off. The treatment is simply so strong that there is a risk we will kill the economy before we kill the deficit’. Yet, after forming a government, he imposed new rounds of austerity measures that included wage cuts, pension cuts and tax increases.

In this political climate, the elections held on the 6th of May 2012 deserve special mention. These elections are undoubtedly unprecedented in modern political and electoral history. Within thirty months, the two parties that had governed since 1981, PASOK and New Democracy, lost 3.3 million votes, resulting in the collapse of PASOK and great losses for New Democracy. At the same time, the rise of the left and the coalition party SYRIZA, along with the emergence of the far right, including the neo-Nazi party Golden Dawn emerging as a national political force, cannot but demonstrate the massive political shift that occurred in the post-dictatorship period and indicate the extent of this political crisis, which has been used as a regulatory biopolitical tool.

3.3 The Rise of Fascism

The pauperising aftereffects of the austerity packages, along with a sustained erosion of popular sovereignty, were also accompanied by the rise of fascism and the emergence of Golden Dawn as a far-right national political force. The party ran a campaign based on addressing austerity and unemployment, featuring the slogan ‘Greece belongs to Greeks’ and a virulently anti-immigration platform. The party’s appeal to a predominantly male constituency that consisted of the working-class and petty-bourgeois strata, along with many

167 At local elections on 7 November 2010 Golden Dawn got 5.3 per cent of the vote in the municipality of Athens, winning a seat at the city council. In neighbourhoods with large immigrant communities it reached 20 per cent. At Greek national elections of 2012, the party received almost 7 per cent of the popular vote – while in the previous general election they had taken 0.23 per cent - and entered the Greek parliament for the first time with 21 delegates. See Spyros Marchetos. 19/06/2012. ‘Golden Dawn and the Rise of Fascism’, The Guardian, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/jun/19/golden-dawn-fascism-greece [accessed 19/05/2013].
of the unemployed, suggests analogies with other historical fascist movements.\(^{168}\) Although there has been a marked increase in the number of racist incidents in recent years, the number of fascist attacks that have taken place against immigrants, asylum seekers and leftists after the rise of Golden Dawn’s popularity is unprecedented.\(^{169}\) Golden Dawn’s rhetoric created a hostile climate for immigrants; racism and xenophobia intensified across the country.\(^{170}\) The situation conveniently enabled the government to adopt fascist anti-immigrant policies. Immigration has been presented as the root of all evils by mainstream political parties and corporate media in a variety of ways. The derogatory term λαθρομετανάστης, a neologism meaning ‘smuggled immigrant’, has even been used in official documents, instead of the more accurate ‘undocumented immigrant’.

In 2012, PASOK Health Minister Andreas Loverdos blamed immigrants for the rise in the number of HIV infections and castigated infected sex workers for their complicity in the spread of the virus; in addition, in order to support his point, he published their personal information. In reality, however, most of the infected women were Greek drug addicts who occasionally engaged in prostitution; the rise in the number of HIV infections had to do with the increase in drug use (a result of social despair) and the collapse of social services due to the austerity measures. Later in the same year, the government executed mass arrests of immigrants and opened detention centres that were characterised by unbearable living conditions.\(^{171}\) The inhumanity of such centres corresponds with the ‘solution’ offered by Health Minister Adonis Georgiadis, who proposed ‘mak[ing] immigrants’ lives as hard as they can get so that they can understand that it is time for them to leave’, and by the Head of Greek Police, who suggested ‘mak[ing] living unbearable for them’.\(^{172}\)


refugees inevitably become stranded in Greece because of EU regulations that prevent them from moving to other European countries). At the same time, the police would show tolerance, or even provide protection, for the activities of neo-Nazi organisations. This particular anti-immigration phase was violently disrupted when Pavlos Fyssas, a Greek anti-fascist rapper, was murdered by a member of Golden Dawn, and the government began to suffer political costs. It was widely believed that the police had been present at the incident but did nothing to prevent the murder.

In other words, the authoritarianism and racism of Golden Dawn are not exceptional but rather an aspect of a broader shift in state politics and strategies. As history has shown, the rise of fascism is accompanied by an authoritarian transformation of state politics and strategies. That is why the growth of Golden Dawn in Greece has reflected changes in the functioning of the state, and there have been calls on the right to integrate elements of the Golden Dawn strategy into a new ‘political hybrid combining neoliberalism with authoritarianism, conservatism and nationalism’. Fascism did not suddenly arise in Greece. It seems that far-right ideas penetrated the public consciousness over the last decades, which, along with the violent pauperisation measures imposed by the Troika and the cultivation of feelings of national persecution and humiliation, have supported the rise of fascism. It should be noted though that Greek fascism is not an isolated case. New fascism is a global phenomenon; Donald Trump and Marine Le Pen are just two indicative examples.

[174] ‘The rise of Golden Dawn cannot be simply attributed to prolonged austerity; it is also the result of deeply rooted authoritarian, racist and conservative ideologies that, when combined with pseudo-solidarity and a simplistic condemnation of the political system, offer an outlet for anger from people who have mainly refrained from collective struggle and solidarity - an outlet that, despite its anti-systemic overtones, is deeply embedded in the system. Golden Dawn’s answer to the crisis is, in the long run, entirely compatible with aggressive neoliberalism, since, despite demanding a protective and paternalistic national state, the party supports the restoration of capitalist power in the workplace’. Ibid.
3.4 Crisis as Biopolitical Tool: The Greek Laboratory

What has been proven over the last five years (2010-2015) was that, no matter how harsh the memorandum policies and austerity measures have been, the initial problem—the public debt crisis—was not addressed, and, in addition, social injustice was promoted, which aggravated the social inequalities that already existed. The adopted tax policy protects large corporations and shifts the financial burden to middle-classes and wage workers, enlarging the class of the ‘working poor’. Poverty and deprivation are increasing, while the unemployment rate has climbed to 28% and is even higher among young people, which has socially marginalised the most dynamic section of the population. The commodification of health and social security services, along with the employment policies promoted by the Memorandum, violates human and labour rights by deregulating employment relations.177

The impact of the financial crisis on the human body and life has been massive. The rise in the suicide rate (which has seen an increase of more than 60%) and infant mortality in Greece, the increase in the number of individuals infected with the HIV virus (by some 200%), the immigrant hunger strikes intended to improve their visibility and inclusion and the construction of detention centres are some of the many factors that demonstrate that life and death have been placed at the heart of political conflict and the debate around the new economic strategies.178 Thus, death, as much as life, has become a political decision and not a biological moment, as philosopher Giorgio Agamben argues in Homo Sacer.179 For Agamben,


the inclusion of ‘bare life’ in the political realm constitutes the core of sovereign power. Thus, the political system has the power to decide not only who is eligible to have human rights but also which lives are worth living. The so-called crisis, which in fact represents the culmination of biopolitical capitalism, is not merely an economic bankruptcy; it has been slowly revealed to function as a means of governing that imposes a new way of living. As the Invisible Committee has stated, ‘what this war is being fought over is not various ways of managing society, but irreducible and irreconcilable ideas of happiness and their worlds’. Legal theorist Costas Douzinas argues that the measures taken by the Greek government and the Troika constitute an immense biopolitical intervention, an attempt to reorganize the relations between life and authority. Neoliberalism is not just a disastrous economic model but a global ideology of governance that pushes people to comprehend their lives and their relations to others solely as consumers and producers. Such social control and discipline, accompanied with such radical changes in behaviours and relationships, has never been seen before in Europe to such an extent. In The Making of the Indebted Man, Maurizio Lazzarato analyses the way in which the control over economic behaviour that is made possible through debt produces effects that extend well beyond the economic field: ‘Debt acts as a “capture”, “predation”, and “extraction” machine on the whole of society, as an instrument for macroeconomic prescription and management, and as a mechanism for income redistribution. It also functions as a mechanism for the production and “government” of collective and individual subjectivities’. Debt therefore becomes an excellent tool for controlling both the human body and life—and, in the case of Greece, for manipulating and subjugating the entire social body to an economic irrationality that many have come to view as a vicious socio-economic experiment with an unpredictable outcome.

3.5 The More Crisis, the More Performance

The cultural sectors in all countries that have suffered from this socio-economic crisis have been greatly affected, as public expenditures on the arts and culture have decreased dramatically. In fact, the cultural domain has been one of the first to experience the impact of the economic crisis. Of course, austerity policies do not only affect the sphere of economics, as the domain of politics is also impacted. Culture and the humanities have been undervalued.
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181 Kostas Douzinas. 2011. Αντίσταση και Φιλοσοφία στην Κρίση [Resistance and Philosophy in Crisis], 64.
globally and are generally considered as being less ‘vital’ to the affluence and well-being of a
country. Subjects such as philosophy, art, history, literature and languages are usually the first
to be deprived of funding. Although the under-funding of the arts and humanities has always
been a problem in Greece, even in prosperous times, public funding has essentially
disappeared as a result of the crisis.\textsuperscript{183}

It is a fact that live art does not require much material equipment and can take place at any
place, at any time. Therefore, during a period of economic crisis, it may seem reasonable to
expect live art to flourish. The Rotterdam-based organisation \textit{Performance Art Event}, which
offers a platform intended to allow performance art to demonstrate its diversity, organised the
2011 performance art event ‘The More Crisis, the More Performance’ in Amsterdam. The
objective of this event was to initiate a discussion concerning the possible revival of the
genre, the low-budget production of performance art and the survival of performance artists
(who do not get paid for their work since, besides tickets, they usually offer nothing for
sale).\textsuperscript{184} Although collectors exist who buy the documentation of performances, for the
majority of performance artists, such documents function as archives rather than income
generators, as I argue in Chapter 5.

Thus, it becomes necessary to discuss the possibility of a revival of performance art. It is a
fact that since (and, for a brief period, before) the global recession of 2008, performance art
and the performing arts in general have been at the centre of the Western art world. Besides
the well-known performance platform \textit{Performa}, a non-profit arts organisation founded by
Roselee Goldberg in 2004, and \textit{Performa 05}, the first biennial of ‘new visual art performance’
to take place since 2005, the number of performance/live art festivals, platforms, biennales
and organisations has, paradoxically or not, increased remarkably.\textsuperscript{185} Museums have also built

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{183} An influential group of leading academics and cultural figures has issued a stark warning that they fear for
the future of the arts and humanities in British universities. Anushka Asthana and Rachel Williams. 28/2/2010.
\url{http://www.theguardian.com/education/2010/feb/28/outcry-threat-cuts-humanities-universities}. See also Stanley

\textsuperscript{184} See \textit{Performance Art Event},
\url{http://performanceartevent.nl/articles/279-2/} and \url{http://performanceartevent.nl/articles/article-the-more-
performance-the-more-crisis/} [both accessed 17/4/2013].

\textsuperscript{185} For \textit{Performa} see \url{http://performa-arts.org/} [accessed 25/4/2013]. A long list of European live art
organisations, festivals and platforms can be found at the \textit{European Live Art Archive},
\url{http://www.liveartarchive.eu/links} and a number of worldwide performance festivals at the \textit{Contemporary
Performance Network}, \url{http://contemporaryperformance.org/page/festivals-1}; neither of the two however
mention any of the performance art festivals taking place in Greece. There is also the annual \textit{Rapid Pulse
International Performance Art Festival} in Chicago, \url{http://rapidpulse.org/}, the month of \textit{Performance Art in
Berlin}, \url{http://mpa-blog.tumblr.com} and the \textit{Cyprus International Performance Art Festival,
\end{footnotesize}
more performance art departments and spaces and have embraced performance in new ways. Let us also not forget Marina Abramović’s retrospective 2010 MOMA exhibition *The Artist is Present*, which serves as an excellent example of how the conditions of performance and the role and status of the performance artist have changed. *The Artist is Present* has contributed to the ‘mainstreamisation’ of performance art by having the genre officially included among MOMA’s ‘high art’ files, while Abramović was transformed almost overnight from avant-garde artist to ‘celebrity darling’ and entered into collaborations with fashion magazines, designers, Lady Gaga and Jay Z, all of which have brought her greater publicity and exposure.  

In Greece, performative artistic practices have enjoyed a resurgence since the late 1990s. However, the flourishing of performance art that has taken place over roughly the last decade (2007 to 2017) is unprecedented. The first ever international performance festival held in Greece was *OPA* in 2007. *OPA* was a collaborative venture between the Greek Institute of Fine Arts and Athens’ Bios arts venue. The *MIR Festival*, an international contemporary festival of performing arts and visual new media, was first organised in Athens in 2008 by the art historian Christiana Galanopoulou, while two further performance art festivals took place in Thessaloniki in 2009: The *Performance Art Festival*, as part of Thessaloniki’s Biennale, and the *Festival of Performing Arts*, organised by the artist Alexandros Plomaritis. Furthermore, in 2010, the *Institute for Live Arts Research* was founded in Athens by the artists and researchers Gigi Argyropoulou, Konstantina Georgelou, Vassilis Noulas, Natascha Siouzouli and Manolis Tsipos, who also launched a periodic publication that is issued in both hard copy and in electronic form twice a year. That same year, Angeliki Avgitidou, a performance artist and assistant professor at the University of Western Macedonia in Florina, co-organised the seminars *Performance Now v.1: Performative Practices in Art and Actions In Situ* at the School of Fine and Applied Arts. In 2013, another non-profit organisation was founded by the artist Dimosthenis Agrafiotis. *Epitelesis - Performance Art Foundation* is an artists’ platform that aims to disseminate the work of artists in the field of performance art. The largest, and possibly most ambitious, project dedicated to performance art in Greece to date was the result of a partnership between NEON (a non-profit contemporary art
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187 The OPA festival was realised two times and the Festival of Performing Arts was realised only once because of financial deadlock. For MIR Festival see http://www.mirfestival.gr/en/index.html [accessed 25/2/2015].

organisation) and MAI (the Marina Abramović Institute) in 2016, which presented As One at the Benaki Museum in Athens over a period of seven weeks. This project consisted of the Abramović Method, newly commissioned performance pieces by Greek artists, and an extensive public program of lectures, workshops, discussions and other public participatory events.\(^{189}\) Performance art has also invaded many different types of festivals, exhibitions and art spaces, either as live art or through its documented form. In many cases, live performances take place on the opening or closing days of festivals or exhibitions. In addition, both the biennales of Athens and Thessaloniki include performance art in their main and/or parallel programmes of events. Indeed, the Athens Biennale of 2013 had a very performative character, and a series of performances took place during the first week. It is no coincidence that Hendrik Folkerts, one of the curators of Documenta 14, which will take place both in Kassel and Greece, has stated that, this time, Documenta 14, rather than having a cohesive narrative, will be more performative.\(^{190}\) It should also be noted that the English term ‘performance’ has lately been widely used in Greek language to describe a variety of artistic activities. The English term is very frequently used to replace the Greek term for a theatrical performance, particularly in the field of theatre. What it is usually implied by this borrowing is the lack of a clear and consistent narrative or structure.

Performance art has also been taught at the School of Fine and Applied Arts at the University of Western Macedonia since 2006. Besides a handful of seminars specifically related to performance art that have occasionally been held at the schools of fine arts in Athens and Thessaloniki in the past few years, performance art as a practice has never been taught at Greek schools of fine art. The same goes for the history and theory of the genre, which are seldom or not at all discussed in Greek schools of fine arts and art history. Most Greek artists who now practice performance art were trained during their postgraduate studies abroad.

It has become evident that there is a renewed interest in performance on the part of artists, curators, institutions and audiences in Greece. The new conditions concerning the production and perception of performance art are considerably different from those that existed during the 1970s. While performance art was once considered fringe or marginal, the genre has nowadays been endorsed not only by artists but by art institutions as well. The remarkable increase in the number of festivals, exhibitions and arts organisations that embrace
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performance art in a new, but less radical way, has contributed to its mainstreamisation not only by offering artists a ‘stage’ on which to perform and a window that offers greater visibility but also by familiarising a broader audience with this form of art. This process of familiarisation has involved both actual performances and promoting an educational and historical approach to performance art, since most of the festivals have also included documentation of historical performances, tributes to performance artists, master classes, lectures and seminars. Overall, the Greek art scene’s newfound interest in performance art has entailed more consistent discussion among art historians on the subject.

3.6 The Performative Aesthetics of Protest

A detailed account of the present political turmoil and its impact was necessary in order to provide context for the diverse performances that are examined in this part of the chapter and that are inextricably linked to the current crisis. In times of recession, performance art often acquires the aesthetics of protest and engages with issues of domination and democracy and, violence and exclusion. The abolition of rights, the control that is exercised over human life and the rise of fascism are central subject matters of the examined performative practices. The third section of this chapter examines a variety of performances that have taken place since the outset of the 2009 financial crisis; it explores how they have adopted the aesthetics of protest and discusses their development and proliferation during the years of the so-called economic crisis.

In May 2009—just a few months before the Greek Prime Minister Konstantinos Karamanlis requested the dissolution of Parliament and called for early parliamentary elections, in which he was defeated by George Papandreou—Mary Zygouri presented her performance The Gaze at the Thessaloniki train station; the context for this was the performance art festival that took place as part of the 2nd Biennale of Thessaloniki. The artist appeared at the entrance of the railway station, dragging thirty heavy white sacks with the words ‘Greek Democracy’ written on them, along with the letters M.Z. and M.K, which were references to her own name and that of Maria Karavela. She entered the station and started hiding the sacks in several different spots: under the seats, within the station’s chapel and in the luggage closets. Some of the viewers participated in this ‘unusual’ action by helping the artist to hide the sacks. She wrote two dates on the floor, ‘1970-2009’, and the word ‘ΒΟΗΘΕΙΑ’[HELP]. Thereafter, she ran
towards the ticket office, intending to obtain a ticket and escape; however, she realised that no train was leaving at that time. Zygouri’s performance made a reference to the work of Maria Karavela, as the use of similar sacks and the word ‘HELP’ in red evoked Karavela’s 1970s performative installations. Although this specific allusion to a historical work of art would be lost on the random bystanders of the train station, many people watching the performance were able to grasp the association between the Junta of the early 1970s and the ‘democracy in question’ or ‘post-democracy’ of 2009. Having been present at the performance, I had the opportunity to have short discussions about the performance with the random viewers, which made me realise that people were able to make this connection. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that I was verbally attacked by one of the viewers, who claimed that the military regime was preferable to today’s ‘so-called democracy’. Such a confrontation is again indicative of the diverse audiences that performance art encounters in public spaces. In her performance, the artist juxtaposed the authoritarian and totalitarian regime of the Junta with the increasingly authoritarian nature of neoliberal democracy that had already manifested in Greek society in the late 2000s (this was shortly before the beginning of the economic crisis, when it became explicitly obvious). The austerity measures, the infringement of human rights and the rise of fascism were shortly to follow.

In 2010, Zygouri presented a series of similar performances in public spaces in Italy, under the title *Democratic Liquidations*; these performances again sought to negotiate the growing ambiguity surrounding the concept of democracy and its social value. One of these performances, called *Democratic Valuations: Sell, Buy, Pawn*, took place in the streets of Rome in December 2010. The artist embarked on a march, setting off from the gallery in the historical centre of Rome, in the vicinity of the Regina Coeli prison. During her march, Zygouri dragged a chariot with forty bulky white sacks attached, which could be considered a painful corporeal prosthesis. These sacks were filled with items intended to represent immaterial concepts, values, ideologies and historical memories. Instead of the word ‘democracy’, the sacks contained information about democracy’s birthplace (Greece), the price, the value and the destination of the products. Zygouri’s first stop was outside the prison, while her second stop was at the International Feminist Centre. At the Ponte Sisto, the artist abandoned the chariot and continued the march, carrying the bags herself. The performance ended at the Monte di Pieta pawnshop, where she delivered the ‘products’ for evaluation; however, no one was there to price them. The artist dropped to her knees,
assuming a praying posture normally associated with temples and worship, and knocked on the pawnshop door, shouting ‘I want to deposit my collateral’. The emergency alarm went off. The duration of the march was about forty minutes; the load was heavy, the pain intense and the artist exhausted. Occasionally, she was shouting for water. Yet, because she was speaking in Greek, no one understood what she was saying. As she explains, she spoke in Greek because she wanted to present herself as a foreigner. During the performance, she was followed by about a hundred people. Her labouring body, with the sacks attached, along with the physical presence of the audience, succeeded in interrupting the normal flow of traffic and displacing the usual order. As Zygouri explains, ‘my body and the audience’s body together create[d] a hole in the city’. 191

Zygouri’s performances depict democracy as an object with a price that can be negotiated and that can be traded with its own value, cost and price. Her body is engaged in Sisyphean acts with references to torment, futility and impossibility. As she explains with regard to the Rome performance, it was not merely the distance and the physical burden that were taxing; above all, she suffered from emotional exhaustion. Occasionally, she felt that she was being perceived as a spectacle. The attributes of endurance and physical pain evoke the performances and works of body art that took place outside of Greece during the 1970s. In *Contract with the Skin: Masochism, Performance Art, and the 1970s* (1998), art historian Kathy O’Dell examines the work of Vito Acconci, Chris Burden, Gina Pane, Marina Abramović and Ulay, among others, and argues that the growth in the popularity of masochistic performance in the 1970s should be seen as a response to the violence of the
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192 Mary Zygouri, interview with E. Kontogeorgiou.
Vietnam War. I would suggest that, in this context, the body in pain should not be examined as a locus of experimentation due to its physical and/or mental (im)potentialities but rather as a Foucauldian ‘docile body’, a product of biopolitics that denotes the power that politics has over life.

Foucault’s concept of docile bodies constructs bodily processes and operations as objects that are subject to the application of power. He illustrates how the modality of control “implies an uninterrupted, constant coercion, supervising the processes of the activity rather than its result and is exercised according to a codification that partitions as closely as possible time, space, movement”. Conspicuously, the ‘processes of the activity rather than its result’ becomes the focus of the embodied exercise of power. Foucault argues that bio-power—i.e. the numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations—‘was without question an indispensable element in the development of capitalism’, making possible ‘the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomena of population to economic processes’. He also examines how the bourgeoisie adopted the disciplinary mechanisms of power—for example, the prison system—as tools for the production of docile bodies for capitalist labour, linking biopolitical logic with the development of capitalism.

Zygouri’s body encapsulates the idea of the body being disciplined, trained to be patient, submissive and to follow the rules. Yet, on the other hand, it is also the body that disrupts ‘normality’ and engages in futile action when it refuses to be productive. Thus, could there also be a ‘rebellion body’?

The aesthetics of protest can also be discerned in a series of performances by Marios Chatziprokopiou. What Does This Country Kill in You? was performed several times in the streets of Thessaloniki and Athens during the period in which public squares were occupied: first, in May 2010, in the area of the White Tower, on Thessaloniki’s waterfront (where people often gathered to protest) and later at the Arch of Gallerius, also in Thessaloniki, during the Thessaloniki Urban Festival (which was organised in support of residents’ rights.
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to public space and the protection of the environment). Chatziprokopiou performed again in June 2011 during a rally at Syntagma Square, opposite the Parliament building in Athens. The artist performed a symbolic ‘funeral’ for the immaterial losses that he and all of the residents of Greece had suffered due to the government’s management of the crisis. In the initial performances, the artist was dressed as tsolias, the folklore national attire of Greek soldiers, and lay unmoving in a makeshift cardboard construction that resembled a coffin. He offered the audience paper, pens and play-dough and invited them to share by writing, drawing or ‘shaping’ their thoughts. He also had with him in the ‘coffin’ some personal objects related to his personal notion of loss: a Greek dictionary, books, photographs and certificates. After an hour or so, covered with the audience’s creations and writings, he stood up, removed his tsolias costume, threw colyva (a wheat-based food that, in the Balkans, is traditionally offered to the living in memory of the dead) at the viewers, poured red wine on the ground and offered some to the audience to drink. He read some audience members’ responses aloud and burnt his personal belongings. He then coloured his face and hands with the ashes, transformed the coffin into a suitcase that contained the immaterial losses as his sole belongings and stood still on the edge of the pier, waiting for the sun to go down.

197 The White Tower is a monument and museum that used to be a notorious prison and place of mass executions during the period of Ottoman rule.
198 In Greek funerals, according to custom, the close relatives/mourners are offered colyva and wine, with some of the later being poured on the grave. Although it is not practiced in all regions in Greece, it is considered part of the tradition.
199 The performance was described to me by the artist in an interview on 15 September 2012. An account of it can also be found in Marios Chatziprokopiou. 2015. ‘What does this Country Kill in You?’, Contemporary Theatre Review, 25/3: 426-428.
Things were quite different in the final version of this work, which was performed on the 28th of June 2011, at Athens’ Syntagma Square. As previously mentioned, throughout May and June 2011, Syntagma Square was occupied by citizens protesting against the new round of austerity measures launched by the government. On the 28th of June 2011, the Medium-Term Economic Program was about to be voted in the Greek Parliament. In the square, thousands of people gathered in a 48-hour protest against the new measures. On this occasion, the artist was joined by two female performers, the art theorist Hypatia Vourloumis and the artist Eirene Efstathiou. All three were dressed like the National Guards but also wore oxygen masks and had their faces covered with Maalox, a white antacid that offers protection against tear-gas. They walked to the upper centre of the square, in front of the Parliament building, and stood still, like the guards. They then took turns lying still in the coffin. Once again, protesters and passers-by were invited to testify as to their losses. A number of concerts were taking place in support of the demonstration, while angry and desperate human voices mingled with the sound of songs and the police’s stun-grenades. In his description of the events, Chatziprokopiou remarked that ‘I can still recall the flash-bangs, intermittent, menacing; the ambulance sirens; the numerous human voices singing, shouting or screaming, chanting slogans or speaking, or drowned out in an unstoppable cough; there was not only
tear-gas, but also asphyxiant gas. Some moments, Syntagma Square gave the impression of a battle-field...’.

What does it mean for an ‘artwork’ to be situated within these specific conditions, and is it acknowledged as a work of art or as a form of imaginative protest? How do people react to art’s invasion of the battlefield of protest? As the artist notes, most people were genuinely excited and showed their approval through praise and applause. Protesters participated either by writing something down or drawing pictures. Some would embrace the performers, while others asked for Maalox due to the liberal use of tear-gas by the police. After some time, the situation got out of control, and protesters started fainting. The performance ended when medics carrying stretchers asked to pass through.

In 2011, relocating performance to a public space defined by agitation and protest redefined the public’s perception of the performance artist. He or she was no longer a ‘weirdo’, making no sense outside the confines of the art institution that had accommodated the imperative to ‘shock the bourgeoisie’, but someone who made perfect sense amidst the urgency and extraordinariness of a common space that had already been activated. What Does this Country Kill in You? was a rather timely question, to which most people who lived in Greece had an answer. This was a participatory performance that focused on loss and mourning, and everybody protesting in Syntagma Square had lost something as a result of the new economic policies. Artists identified with the protesters, and the audience-protesters identified with the artists, breaking down the boundaries between life and art. Performance emerged as a co-ordinated act, a public ritual where familiar yet previously unconnected or loosely connected objects-as-images (the gas mask, the tsolias attire, the makeshift coffin and so on) were recast as commonly understood symbols of social collapse.

Identification between artist and viewer did not occur the first and second times that Chatziprokopiou performed in Thessaloniki. Being more viewers than participants, those who attended the Thessaloniki performances appeared more sceptical when attempting to decipher the image of the tsolias in a coffin. The tsolias was a national symbol of past courage and patriotism; however, miniature tsolias figurines are sold in tourist shops, which suggests tourist industry kitsch. As it had been used by several Greek artists since 2009, the tsolias could hardly be disassociated from the intention to mock an authoritarian nationalist state or the petty-bourgeoisie happily married pater familias (the οικογενειάρχης, or head of the
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family), who had never anticipated its deliberate inclusion in street protest. Feelings of ambiguity or outright scorn toward the *tsolias* image were absent when the performance took place at Syntagma Square. No one recognised him or herself in the coffin; they all wanted to bury the state.

3.7 Performance-Lecture, or, Another Narrative of Protest

In June 2012, Greek social researcher and photographer Myrto Tsilimpounidi and South African performance studies scholar Ally Walsh co-presented the performance-lecture *It’s a Beautiful Thing the Destruction of Wor(l)ds* at the Berlin Biennale Conference (28-29 June) *Preoccupied: The Wounds, Words and Workings of Occupations Past and Present*. The performance-lecture was based on the events and series of protests that had taken place during the Greek crisis. Following the Berlin Biennale, the performance was also presented, in a slightly modified form, in several other contexts, including workshops and conferences on riot and revolt, occupation and anarchism, protest and creativity and capitalism and resistance.201

As the audience entered the room wherein the Berlin Biennale Conference was to be held, house music was played, and the performers handed out gas masks to some of the viewers, while they applied Maalox to each other’s faces. The performers also distributed leaflets with statistics about unemployment, poverty, the number of homeless people and the increased use of antidepressants and suicide rates in Greece. An assortment of speeches and statements were hung from a washing line, which was placed close to a slide projection of photographs from the city of Athens. Tsilimpounidi recited a text concerning occupation as a form of resistance, the collective mobilisation of the multitudes, daily stories and struggles, resistance performances in Athens, the city as a platform for negotiation and dialogue, austerity measures, mass immigration and the social malaise known as ‘crisis’. She talked about the concept of a new language and discussed protests as visual markers of the complex discourses of power struggles; she also explained how marginality and counter-cultures establish a new

reality that must be seen and heard. Through the use of photographs, Athens was depicted as a terrain of conflict and transformation. Both performers declared that the city streets are political, stating that ‘[i]n Athens, in the current milieu, time is marked out not by changing seasons, but between instalments of debt relief from the IMF and the EU. It is also mapped by politically motivated protests, gatherings and events’. In the second part of the performance, they invited the audience to participate in the ‘protests in the square’ by donning the gas masks and using the protective cream against tear gas. Audience members were asked to read statistics out loud and then place them on the washing line. Participants were also asked to loudly pronounce the word λευτεριά, a popular version of the more formal ελευθερία, which means ‘freedom’. They talked about the demonisation of protesters by the police, the use of tear-gas and plastic bullets, the unjust prosecutions and the conversion of the central streets of Athens into urban battlefields. They further discussed the significance and meaning of protests that disrupt ‘business as usual’ and attempt to create a more inclusive and participatory space, arguing that ‘[b]y creating a march in the midst of the city space, the protesters achieve a subversion of the hegemonic uses of space.’ They then announced to the viewer-protesters that those with masks on would be arrested and put on trial for participating in riots and destruction of public property and would face three years in jail, while those with Maalox-covered faces would be arrested for civil disobedience. Those without masks or Maalox who had not been hospitalised would get to go home, make calls to lawyers and spread the news about the arrests. They commanded the audience to ‘[s]it down. Count money.’ In the final part of the performance, they invited the viewers to add, through statements, their own forms of resisting and to hang their thoughts on the washing line. As the artists said, ‘the sentences will hang together, forming a map of how we can creatively and collaboratively destroy this world and imagine a new one’.

Tsilimpoundi and Walsh combined elements of both lecture and performance to convey a narrative of political protest. The facts and figures regarding the Greek crisis informed those
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202 [This refers to the year 2012] The official unemployment rate is 21%: for the age group 18-30, that figure stands at almost 60%. The riot forces have trebled in ranks since 2009, although exact data are not provided by the government. Andre Mazurek, a Polish protester, was detained for 4 years without a free and fair trial, for taking part in a peaceful protest. There has been a 45% increase in the use of antidepressants. There have been 20,000 new homeless people in Athens alone since 2011. The suicide rate doubled in 2011, almost tripled in the first months of 2012. On 5 April 2012, Dimitris Christoulas committed suicide in Syntagma Square as a result of the economic crisis. 1 out of 3 Greeks lives below the poverty threshold. 3 June 2012: There is a shortage of medication. People with cancer cannot access treatment; state run hospitals made a call to stop non-essential surgical interventions because of a critical shortage of gloves, syringes and gauze. MSF declare this a humanitarian crisis. June 2012: second round elections granted far-right Golden Dawn 7%, which means parliamentary representation by fascists. This also grants them MP Asylum.
who lacked first-hand experience of the Greek recession (as the performance took place in other European countries) about the systemic political violence, the human rights violations and the police brutality that the country had experienced. What distinguishes the performance from a mere lecture or conference paper is the symbolic gestures of the artists and the requirement of audience participation. Although Tsilimpoundi and Walsh strove to convince their audience that ‘resistant performances in Athens have gathered momentum over the last year, transforming the fixed landscape of a city into a platform for negotiation and dialogue’, including the audience in the performance by handing out gas masks and Maalox was not conducive to any sort of democratic process or dialogue; on the contrary, it was indicative of the infringement of people’s right to protest. The performers projected on the participants’ bodies the outcome of the fascistic criminalisation of the right to protest. The protesters were forced to wear gas masks to avoid suffocation and were told that they were very likely to be arrested as a result of their participation in demonstrations or strikes. Of course, wearing a mask or applying Maalox cream when viewing a biennale or attending a conference cannot reproduce the fear of suffocation or of being severely injured and/or arrested while protesting, but these actions can convey an impression of an unpleasant situation, which could be thought provoking.

The significance and effects of the square protests are still fraught with ambiguity. Given the pace of the transformation of Greek society since 2009 and its self-image before then, it is hardly inconceivable that many of those drawn to public protest in the streets of Greece were not actually demanding anti-capitalist revolutionary change but ‘a return to a disrupted “business as usual”’. Commenting on the diversity of recent global protests, Slavoj Žižek has remarked that what unites them is that they are all reactions to different aspects of capitalist globalisation. However, he emphasises that

The protesters aren’t pursuing any identifiable ‘real’ goal. The protests are not ‘really’ against global capitalism, ‘really’ against religious fundamentalism, ‘really’ for civil freedoms and democracy, or ‘really’ about any one thing in particular. What the majority of those who have
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participated in the protests are aware of is a fluid feeling of unease and discontent that sustains and unites various specific demands.\textsuperscript{204} In terms of audience engagement, according to the two performers, the manner in which the performance was framed led to different reactions. In some cases, people were more aware of the situation in Greece (and in Southern Europe) and were therefore more affected. However, it seems that the performance provoked fruitful engagement, which was expressed either during the Q&A session or the coffee breaks that followed. The most engaging and provocative comments began with the same opening words: ‘Sorry, I didn’t say anything right after the performance, but I felt that words would spoil it…’ or ‘I needed time to recover and absorb it’.\textsuperscript{205} It should be noted that Greece was not an isolated case of political changes leading to the rise of, and return to, intense performance practice. The aesthetics of protest have been adopted in performative practices by at least several artists in the West and elsewhere as well. Ai Weiwei and Anish Kapoor’s 2015 walking performance, in which they led a refugee protest, is an exemplary paradigm that bears similarities in terms of an aesthetic of protest, to the Greek performances discussed. Together, Weiwei and Kapoor walked east from central London to Kapoor’s 2012 sculpture, \textit{Orbit}, in Stratford. A focal point of the walk was London’s East End, home for centuries to immigrants fleeing oppression and deprivation, including Jews, French Huguenots, Irish, and Bangladeshis. Both artists carried a blanket to symbolise the fundamental human rights to rest and security. The artists have stated that they will walk together again in other cities.\textsuperscript{206} In the months before this walk, thousands of desperate Middle Eastern and African migrants attempted to cross Europe’s borders, with hundreds drowning or being assaulted by water cannon and tear-gas. Governments across the world failed dismally to prevent the unfolding disaster. Weiwei and Kapoor walked to draw attention to the need for a coordinated, global and proportionate humanitarian response to this worldwide refugee crisis.


\textsuperscript{205} Information was given to the author by Myrto Tsimpinoudi through email correspondence, 10/10/2013.

4. Performance Art and the Art Institution: Within or Without?

Although, in the West, the 1960s and 1970s have been characterised by artists’ efforts to critique the institutions of art and to create art outside of museums and galleries, in Greece the absence of a powerful art institution—or, at least, its slow and tortuous emergence—made many artists adopt a positive stance towards it or, to be more precise, towards its establishment. This does not mean, however, that they did not also critique the established role of the institution. Theodoros’s overt critique of the commercialisation and display of art in traditional bourgeois museums in his manifesto for *Sculpture for Public Participation- Participation Prohibited* is an exemplary paradigm. According to Peter Bürger, ‘[t]he autonomous status and the concept of the work of art operative in the bourgeois institution of art imply separation from social life. This is essential for an art intending to interpret the world at a distance. For such an aesthetic project, a concept of the work of art as being a closed, albeit “complex” unity is appropriate. Avant-garde aesthetic praxis, though, aimed to intervene in social reality’.207 Although Theodoros’s work was presented within the institution, it is this separation of the work of art from social life and its status as commodity that he intended to critique. He focused on the intrusion of art into socio-political reality, or, in other words, the unification of art and life, which, according to Bürger, was intended by the avant-garde and ‘can only be achieved if it succeeds in liberating aesthetic potential from the institutional constraints which block its social effectiveness. In other words: the attack on the institution of art is the condition for the possible realisation of a utopia in which art and life are united’.208 For Bürger, ‘the failure of the avant-garde utopia of the unification of art and life coincides with the avant-garde’s overwhelming success within the art institution’.209 The Greek example of the 1970s, however, suggests otherwise. Despite being actualised within the art institution, the performances succeeded, even if momentarily, in bringing art into direct dialogue with life.

It was during the late 1950s and the 1960s—shortly before the coup d’etat—that the number of art galleries in Athens increased and art exhibitions began being organised in cities other than Greece’s capital. Along with the growth of tourism, contemporary Greek art was, for the first time, attracting the attention of foreign collectors. The expansion of the art market led to


209 Ibid., 705.
the further proliferation of contemporary art venues and exhibitions.210 The idea for the creation of a museum of contemporary art was first expressed in 1959, but it was only in 1976 that an actual discussion of the subject took place. From that point on, long debates were hosted in the political and cultural magazine Anti concerning the establishment of a museum of contemporary art. Such an institution was envisioned as existing not only to protect and exhibit works of contemporary art but also to participate in the production of contemporary art, contribute to the development of cultural education and attract a broader audience, ranging from the elite to the working class. In addition, a series of events were organised at Desmos by gallerist Manos Pavlidis and artist Theodoros regarding the possibility of founding an art museum that would not turn out to be an instrument of state power. During these events, it was not only specialists and professionals from the art world who expressed opinions but the potential audiences of such a museum of contemporary art also contributed to the discussions through completing questionnaires.211 The debates were influenced by theory concerning institutional critique, but the museum remained unrealised. It is only in 1998 that the State Museum of Contemporary Art opened its doors in Thessaloniki, while the National Museum of Contemporary Art in Athens began operations in 2000.

After the seizure of power by the colonels, the leftist artists who wished to express their opposition and incite resistance against authority refused to participate in state-organised events such as the Panhellenic exhibitions. These artists turned to alternative art spaces, private venues, galleries (some of which, such as Desmos and Ora, while privately owned, functioned more as art centres than commercial galleries, as mentioned previously) and foreign institutes. Theodoros exhibited his work both at the Goethe Institute and Desmos Gallery, while Alithinos and Karavela’s works were presented in private galleries as well. These specific galleries supported dissident art and played an important role in the development of a Greek avant-garde. Karavela, however, chose to present her second provocative environment—with the prison cells alluding to the regime’s political prisoners—at the Hilton Gallery. The Hilton was built between 1958 and 1963 and represented the first example of prestigious architecture in post-war Athens. It was emblematic of the general economic and cultural prosperity of the time and reflected the country’s hesitant


211 For a detailed analysis of the discussions in Anti magazine and in Desmos gallery see Irene Gerogianni. 2013. ‘Όταν “Οι Καλλιτέχνες Συζητούσαν Αδύναμα”: Τοποθετήσεις, Υποθέσεις, Διερεύνησεις για ένα Μουσείο Σύγχρονης Τέχνης στην Ελλάδα’ [When “Artists Chatted Incessantly”: Positionings, Premises, Investigations for a Museum of Contemporary Art in Greece], Κριτική + Τέχνη [Critique + Art], 05: 124-141.
modernisation and entry into the global luxury market. In other words, the Hilton Hotel stood as a grand symbol of capitalism and power, the two main themes in Karavela’s critical work. The artist was not, of course, unaware of the Hilton Hotel’s significance in both the Greek context and globally; on the contrary, it seems that she used this specific gallery in order to make the discrepancy between her work and its context even more apparent. The strong antithesis that resulted from the coexistence of the Hilton’s transnational haute bourgeoisie clientele and the reality of imprisonment and torture in Greece could only make the feeling of discomfort more intense. According to Gerogianni,

> With the notion of the political in art tied to the particular configuration of left politics, within which it remained even after the fall of the Junta, body art and performance art of the 1970s in Greece could indeed be described as defiant, although not in the same, broader terms we usually associate it with, i.e. as an institutional critique, either as a conscious course towards dematerialisation, or as a critique on the grounds of difference, mainly as a discourse on identity and sexual politics.

However, it is my contention that it would be naive to suggest that the artists examined in the first part of this chapter did not have any interest in institutional critique because of the absence of a museum of contemporary art in Greece. The authority of the museum, as a metonymy for the art institution at large, has been questioned in most of the works examined. The ephemerality of these works signified a questioning of the established notion of a work of art both as a commodity and museum exhibit—despite the fact that, at the time, critical theories that connected the museum and the art market were not, for the most part, available to Greek artists. The incorporation of live action that dissolved the boundary between process and outcome as a crucial artistic element was indicative of a turn to social and political life as the new arena of art.

During the first and second waves (from the late 1960s to the early 1970s, and from the 1980s, respectively) of institutional critique, art institutions were seen, as Robert Smithson put it, as spaces of ‘cultural confinement’ and circumscription, and therefore as something that
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should be attacked aesthetically, politically and theoretically. The institution was therefore considered to be problematic for artists.\textsuperscript{214} However, as Simon Sheikh notes,

\[\ldots\text{the current institutional-critical discussions seem predominantly propagated by curators and directors of the very same institutions, and they are usually opting for rather than against them. That is, they are not an effort to oppose or even destroy the institution, but rather to modify and solidify it. The institution is not only a problem, but also a solution.}\textsuperscript{215}\]

Sheikh concludes his article by suggesting that institutional critique could be viewed not as belonging to a historical period or a genre within art history but rather as ‘an analytical tool, a method of spatial and political criticism and articulation that can be applied not only to the artworld, but to disciplinary spaces and institutions in general’.\textsuperscript{216} An ‘institutionalised critique’, as he terms it, would then question the role of education, historicization and how institutional auto-critique becomes a mechanism of control within new modes of governmentality, precisely through the very fact of its internalisation.\textsuperscript{217}

A few months before Sheikh published these thoughts, Andrea Fraser explained in her article ‘From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique’ that the question of what is inside and what is outside of the institution becomes complex when the notion of ‘the institution’ does not refer to specific places, organisations, and individuals but rather to a conception of it as a social field.\textsuperscript{218} Frazer maintains that institutional critique has always been institutionalised since ‘it could only have emerged within and, like all art, can only function within the institution art’.\textsuperscript{219} It is therefore not a question of being against the institution: ‘We are the institution. It's a question of what kind of institution we are, what kind of values we institutionalise, what forms of practice we reward, and what kinds of rewards we aspire to’.\textsuperscript{220}

It becomes evident from the writings of Sheikh and Fraser that both the Greek performances of the 1970s (even if they were realised within the art institution) and the discussions among

\textsuperscript{215} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{217} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{218} Andrea Fraser. 2005. ‘From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique’, \textit{Artforum} (September), 44/1(September), 280.
\textsuperscript{219} Ibid., 281.
\textsuperscript{220} Ibid., 283.
artists and the public regarding the establishment of a museum that can escape its traditional role reveal a great interest in institutional critique.

However, it is also worth noting that a different experiment that serves to critique the art institution has existed since 2011, namely the case of the occupation and re-activation of the historical Embros theatre building in Athens, which the Greek Ministry of Culture has left empty and unused for years, by the Mavili Collective. The collective ‘was formed during summer 2010 as an autonomous collective structure for emergent practitioners and came together in order to re-think and re-imagine the current Greek cultural landscape and propose structures, platform collaborations, [and] projects that produce new alternatives’ and ‘is committed to producing nomadic, autonomous collective cultural zones that appear and disappear beyond the logics of the market’, as stated on their website.221 On the 11th of November 2011, the Collective occupied the Embros theatre building and proposed an alternative model of collective management and new, contemporary forms of creative work. Embros became a public space for exchange, research, debate, meeting and re-thinking not only for the collective but also for many other people not necessarily interested in art but in a new way of being. Ephemeral performances, along with organised discussions, participatory actions and food sharing, have been taking place since; a great number of Greek and foreign artists, academics, theorists and activists have presented their work, drawing large audiences. Although it has been shut down by the police several times, as it is considered illegal, it has consistently managed to re-open.222 As art historian Elpida Karaba notes, the Embros case could signal a shift towards a form of institutional critique that, as described by Gerald Rauning, is concerned with a terrain where art and politics overlap.223 Embros is a space where activism and art experimentation can be pursued, challenging property, law and order and commercial art, and it has the potential to become a platform for reform and rebellion.224 In other words, Embros has the potential, and the intention, to achieve a total dissociation of the making of art from capitalism, the complexities of which are further discussed in Chapter 5.

222 See also Embros Theatre Website, https://www.embros.gr/ [accessed 16/4/2017].
224 Ibid., 214-215.
Conclusions

Drawing from the case studies included in this chapter there are three important issues to be further discussed: 1) The engagement of diverse audiences and the role of the performance site. 2) A reading of these artworks beyond the specificities of the socio-political and economic turmoil taking place in Greece and 3) the possibility of protest’s aestheticisation through such activist performance practice.

The performative and experimental language used by the artists discussed in the first part of this chapter, can be only partly associated with the corresponding Western art trends since, despite the similarities in the medium and the intention of critique and socio-political engagement, the framework and conditions of the production and reception of art were considerably different. Art historian Nikos Daskalothanasis maintains that Greek artists were less interested in the critique of a market consumerism (which in militarised Greece was still in its infancy) and more interested in the ‘clarity of the political message’.225 He also suggests that in the 1970s artistic experimentation ‘had to’ claim a political realm of existence which in the West was already considered as given. For these reasons, and given the absence of a substantial domestic market and a specific institutional framework, Daskalothanasis suggests that ‘the experimental art of the 1970s in Greece was bound to have a limited impact, on a circle mostly of those directly concerned’226. It is true that the artists of the 1970s intended to transmit a clear political message and that performance art was inextricably connected to social struggles. Yet the analysis of the specific performances in this chapter has shown not only that the experimentation with performative practices had a significant impact and attracted new audiences beyond the art lovers and professionals but also that artists (at least the ones discussed here) were indeed interested in a critique of the art institutions despite the lack of both a considerable domestic market and an institutional framework. Karavela’s insistence that art should take the form of a social and political event instead of being captured in museum walls, Theodoros’s ironic manifesto on the destination of artworks and Alithinos’s critique of the bourgeoisie are indicative of such a stance. Moreover, the political conditions clearly contributed to the easier acceptance of such new forms of art by the public. As Martha Christofoglou notes, while the art public of the West discovered references to the historical avant-gardes of the 1920s, mainly to Dada, the Greek public discovered disguised

226 Ibid.
protests against the junta. The deficient awareness and the conservatism of the average Greek viewer would probably have led to the rejection of any radical artistic novelty, had the political climate been smoother.\footnote{Martha Christofoglou. 1995. ‘Ο Εκσυγχρονισμός της Νεοελληνικής Τέχνης και οι Μεγάλες Διαμάχες (1950-1980) [The modernisation of Greek Art and the Great Disputes]. Αρχαιολογία-Τέχνες [Archaeology-Arts], 57 (December), 45.}

It becomes obvious that the new artistic language, though novel and unconventional, was well received from the Greek public because of its extremely current and accurate content. These radical forms were welcomed as the most suitable to transmit radical messages. An important parameter for this immediate response on behalf of the viewers was also, as discussed earlier, the fact that the visitors of the specific exhibitions were not particularly or necessarily interested in the new forms of art or art in general as much as in politics and resistance. It could be said that the transmitted messages and the strong engagement of the audience constituted a threat to the dictator’s power since in several cases the police intervened and shut the exhibitions down forcing in some cases the artists to leave the country so as not to be arrested. On the contrary, in the recent examples of performance art as protest the visitors had different characteristics. In the case of Mary Zygouri, the performance *The Gaze* realised within the framework of a biennale, attracted viewers that were mainly people from the art world, namely curators, art historians and artists along with some random viewers that happened to be at the train station. The performance-lecture by Tsilimpounidi and Walsh when realised as part of an international conference on riot and revolution had an audience of academics and university students while when it was presented in the Berlin Biennale the viewers were again mainly art lovers and professionals. The audiences of Biennales and art festivals are largely people that attend artistic performances because of their interest primarily in art and perhaps in politics as well. On the other hand the audience of Marios Chatziprokopiou comprised exclusively the protesters who again identified with the artist and participated eagerly in the production of the performance – protest.

The second important issue to be discussed in relation to the works examined in the chapter is their relation to different concepts of violence which has been present either explicitly or implicitly. Violence cannot but be related to fascism and fascism has certainly many faces. What can be detected in the performances discussed in the chapter is the designation/tracking down of different forms of both violence and fascism. As Foucault has noted, fascism has numerous varieties: ‘from the enormous ones that surround and crush us to the petty ones that
constitute the tyrannical bitterness of our everyday lives’. The explicit use of both psychological and physical violence by the colonels against the dissidents is covertly designated in the performances of the early 1970s. Yet the ‘symbols’ used by the artists in the mid and late 1970s and 1980s (plaster, cages, the matraque phallus, ‘mutilated’ bodies) and the ones used in the performances of the 2000s and 2010s (oxygen masks and Maalox, attire of tsolias, the bags and the overloaded body) should not be considered as mere references to ‘subjective violence’ but also and perhaps primarily as symbols of capitalism’s latent violence.

Whereas the visible signals of violence are acts of crime, terror, civil unrest and international conflict, there are two more kinds of violence that, according to Slavoj Žižek, sustain ‘our very efforts to fight violence and to promote tolerance’: Subjective violence is just the most visible portion of a triumvirate that also includes two objective kinds of violence. First, there is a ‘symbolic’ violence embodied in language and its forms, what Heidegger would call ‘our house of being’. ... This violence is not only at work in the obvious—and extensively studied – cases of incitement and of the relations of social domination reproduced in our habitual speech forms: there is a more fundamental form of violence still that pertains to language as such, to its imposition of a certain universe of meaning. Second, there is what I call ‘systemic’ violence, or the often catastrophic consequences of the smooth functioning of our economic and political systems.

One could say then than symbolic violence signifies the indirect and usually unacknowledged violence of capitalist domination –for Žižek the most prominent aspect of symbolic violence would be ideology. For Jacques Lacan the symbolic or the symbolic order is a universal structure encompassing the entire field of human action and existence. It involves the function of speech and the immersion into language and it appears as a largely unconscious order of laws, regulations and internalised forms of oppression. While subjective violence is visible and directly experienced in relationships of dominance/ power, symbolic violence
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demonstrates an implicit order of oppression and power. Systemic violence, another form of objective violence, is inherent in a system and it involves not only direct physical violence but also ‘the more subtle forms of coercion that sustain relations of domination and exploitation, including the threat of violence’.\(^\text{232}\) One could say that systemic violence, that relates to class antagonism, exploitation, colonialism etc., is more visible than symbolic violence but less visible than subjective violence which is the most discernible of all three.

Pierre Bourdieu had also proposed a concept of symbolic violence as one produced through language and discourse in 1991. For Bourdieu symbolic violence naturalises the power and dominance relations and legitimates the domination system. Symbolic violence is therefore, though less visible, more powerful than physical / subjective violence in that it is entrenched in the very modes of action and structures of cognition of individuals, imposing the spectre of legitimacy of the social order.\(^\text{233}\) While subjective violence is seen as a perturbation of the ‘normal’ state of things and therefore visible, objective violence, being in effect the heart of capitalist ideology, is precisely the violence inherent to this ‘normal’ state of things.\(^\text{234}\)

These underlying structures of violence inherent to our basic interactions, and related to the latent fascism of biopolitical capitalism can be detected in Theodoros’s matraque-phallus, Alithinos’s use of mirror and the symbolism of the middle-class dining table, Karavela’s insults towards the public and denouncement of the bourgeois way of living, Zygouri’s docile body, Chatziprokiou’s gas mask and allusion to the death of tsolias as symbol of the authoritarian, nationalist state or the petty bourgeoisie of happily married pater familias, and finally Tsilimpoundi and Walsh’s anti-capitalist manifesto accompanied with gas masks and Maalox.

Objective violence took on a new shape with capitalism, as Žižek explains, and cannot but related to biopolitical violence, I would add.\(^\text{235}\) As André Duarte has noted ‘biopolitical violence has become the common denominator of contemporary politics, reducing the distance between modern mass representative democracies and totalitarian regimes’.\(^\text{236}\) Yet biopolitical violence is not only a matter of simply blurring the differences and therefore simplistically identifying totalitarianism and representative democracies, although one should also be ‘attentive to the political blackmail implied by the obstinate repetition of a simplistic

\(^{232}\) Žižek, 2009, 8.
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opposition of totalitarianism and mass democracies’. Žižek has referred to the ideological use of the concept of totalitarianism as a helpful warning that actually uses the spectre of a possible resurgence of totalitarian regimes to weaken any radical political alternative. This political blackmail goes like this: ‘it is better to accept the inequalities and absurdities of capitalism with its liberal economic and political foundations than to abolish it through totalitarian and genocidal regimes’. To put it in another way as Duarte notes, the analysis of totalitarianism stays a fundamental way of realising and comprehending the totalitarian dangers that surround our actually existing democracies. Thus, ‘what really matters now is to understand the rather perverse biopolitical mechanisms through which human beings have been both included and excluded from the political and economical spheres in mass- and market oriented democracies and in totalitarian regimes’.

It is a fact that many modern historical elements of totalitarian regimes still remain greatly present today: ‘racism, xenophobia, political apathy and indifference, economic and territorial imperialism, the use of lies and violence in mass proportions as a means to dominate whole populations, the multiplication of homelessness, of refugees, of those with no country, as well as the growing superfluousness of a huge mass of human beings deprived of citizenship and economic dignity’. We should therefore be thoughtful not only of the possible appearance of new totalitarian regimes, but also to the quasi-totalitarian elements that arise in the core of our representative mass democracies.

Finally, there is yet another aspect of activist artistic practices that should be considered in relation to a possible aestheticisation of protest. Performance art has, in the cases examined, acquired the aesthetics of protest. Although such performative gestures may have a critical potential, they may also aestheticise the act of protest and thus reduce the potentiality for awareness or change since the act of aestheticisation and ‘spectacularisation’ could perhaps eradicate their political potential. Such criticism is mainly rooted in the writing of Walter Benjamin and Guy Debord who claimed that the aestheticisation and spectacularisation of politics and political protest divert attention away from the practical goals of protest and towards its aesthetic form. In other words, as Boris Groys has noted, the art element of art
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activism is seen as the main reason why this kind of activism fails on practical level and does not have an immediate social and political impact. Of course, this does not mean that social and political activism fails only when it is related to art.\textsuperscript{243} It is actually particularly difficult, or, practically impossible to estimate the impact of political protest even when it is not aestheticised and specularised. Such a critique of activist art in the form of protest renders art useless, Boris notes, and has led artists to what is now called ‘useful art’ (which will be further discussed in Chapter 4).\textsuperscript{244} Yet as Boris explains, the word ‘aestheticisation’ is used ‘in a confused and confusing way’.\textsuperscript{245} In the domain of design, aestheticisation refers to the attempt to make something more attractive to the user in terms of design. The author notes, however, that this notion of aestheticisation has nothing to do with the one used by Walter Benjamin when he was speaking about fascism as the aestheticisation of politics; in this case aestheticisation is related to modern art and not design; aestheticisation means thus the ‘defunctionalisation of this tool, the violent annulations of its practical applicability and efficiency’.\textsuperscript{246} Thus, as Groys maintains, ‘artistic aestheticisation is the opposite of aestheticisation by means of design. The goal of design is to aesthetically improve the status quo—to make it more attractive. Art also accepts the status quo—but it accepts it as a corpse, after its transformation into a mere representation’.\textsuperscript{247} While design wants to make reality more attractive, art seems to accept reality as it is and that means that it accepts ‘the status quo as dysfunctional, as already failed’.\textsuperscript{248} On the other hand, art activism uses art as a tool in the political struggles, which is the case for the performances examined in this chapter. Both in the 1970s and the 2010s artists used performative practices to participate in political action and critique the dysfunctional status quo. To conclude in Groys words, total aestheticisation does not block political action; it enhances it. Total aestheticisation means that we see the current status quo as already dead, already abolished. And it means further that every action that is directed towards the stabilisation of the status quo will ultimately show itself as ineffective—and every action that is directed towards the destruction of
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the status quo will ultimately succeed. Thus, total aestheticisation not only
does not preclude political action; it creates an ultimate horizon for
successful political action, if this action has a revolutionary perspective.249

Of course, as Chantal Mouffe (among others) has noted, artistic activism cannot on its own
bring about the end of neo-liberal hegemony. Traditional forms of political action, like parties
and trade-unions cannot be avoided.250 Yet artistic activism as discussed in this chapter, along
with artistic intervention in the public space that is explored next, has the potential to
contribute to the struggle against capitalist domination through the formation of a critique
that will not be ‘automatically recuperated and neutralised by capitalism’.251
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Chapter 2

Performance as Intervention: Participation, the Public Sphere and the Production of Meaning

Introduction

Throughout the past few decades, artists in Greece have shown an increasing interest in the use of public space and the concept of art as intervention. The conditions under which art is viewed and how the participation of diverse audiences can be encouraged have also been central issues in the work of several artists. ‘Intervention’ here denotes an articulation of art and the public sphere that permits a range of meaningful relationships among the two. Artists have used the tactics of intervention to create unexpected situations and disrupt or deconstruct existing ones.\(^{252}\) In this chapter, I explore the diversity of interventions associated with performance art in Greece and examine the defining roles of public space and identity in the production of meaning. I also discuss the different types of audience involvement and participation that arise from artistic actions that take place in public spaces.

More specifically, in the first section of this chapter, I provide a framework for approaching the notion of public space and its association with art, before proceeding to examine specific case studies. In the second section, I consider interventionist performances that are defined by either site specificity or national and place identity. This part also discusses the performative works of non-Greek artists who live and work in Greece. In the third section, the focus shifts to works wherein the artist attempts a consensual intervention through her ‘integration’ into specific spaces, be they public or semi-public, while the fourth section examines collective interventions that take place in cities and the case of $\textit{Sfîna}$ [meaning ‘wedge’], the Greek flash mob. How is artistic intervention defined in terms of its relation to place and audience? Could a critical discourse be developed around a typology of artistic intervention? These are some of the research questions used to organise the material presented in this section.

\(^{252}\) It is interesting to note that Nato Thomson and Gregory Sholette have published a user’s manual for creative artistic interventions in everyday life discussing several paradigms of interventionist performative practices. \textit{The Interventionists: Users' Manual for the Creative Disruption of Everyday Life}. 2004. Cambridge: MIT and MASS MoCA.
1. The Question of Public Space and Art

The notion of public space is a topic that has been discussed and analysed since the beginning of Western philosophy. The twentieth century has produced various philosophical, sociological, geographical, anthropological, architectural and political interpretations of the concept of public space, the meaning of and context for which have changed throughout the years. There are two meanings that are most commonly attributed to the term public space: a) one that refers to space as a physical concept, whereby ‘public space’ consists of any space in which one interacts or co-exists with others and b) one that refers to spaces that not only promote and require the production of speech in the presence of others but also make possible, and permit, direct confrontation. The restrictions and rules that some public spaces—which are, in fact, private—impose, as set by their owners, have led to the more precise term ‘semi-public’ spaces, meaning those places where any individual can be present under specific conditions. The complexities encountered in attempting to define the term public space can either restrict its meaning, expand its dimensions or both. In addition, with the proliferation of social media, the public sphere has become hybridised, incorporating both geographical and virtual spaces. Social media can therefore amplify the concept of public space since they enable new possibilities for participation in the public sphere.\(^{253}\)

As many theorists of public art have argued, public space is not only a domain where artistic interventions (either in the form of objects or performance) take place. Rather, a public space can also be produced, for example through confrontation and conflict. Oliver Marchart argues that it is only at the precise moment of antagonism that the public sphere can actually exist.\(^{254}\) Art in public spaces, or public art, has been one of the dominant trends in Western art over the last thirty or so years. It has therefore been extensively discussed and analysed by theorists and scholars in an effort to examine various aspects of the correlation between the terms ‘art’ and ‘public space’. Rosalyn Deutsche notes the following:

_Inevitably, statements about public art are also statements about public space, whether public art is construed as ‘art in public places’, ‘art that__


creates public spaces’, ‘art in the public interest’, or any other formulation that brings together the words ‘public’ and ‘art.’

Evidently, public art encompasses a wide range of forms and actions, including sculptures, installations, performances and participatory projects. Art historian Mary Jane Jacob has coined the term ‘new-genre public art’ to describe a kind of art that brings artists into direct engagement with audiences with the intention of grappling with the compelling issues of our time. Specifically, she associates new-genre public art with three kinds of work:

One is emblematic: objects or actions that embody the social problem or make a political statement and by their presence in a public setting hope to inspire change. A second is supportive: works conceived and created by the artist that, upon presentation, are designed to be linked to others, ultimately feeding back into an actual social system…A third type is participatory, whereby the concept of the work and perhaps its actual production come out of a collaborative process. It aims to make a lasting impact on the lives of the individuals involved, be of productive service to the social network, or contribute to remedying the social problem.

Consequently, public art falls into diversified categories. However, as I argue in this chapter, different typologies of performative interventions can also be identified in relation to a work’s interaction with public space. My intention is to show through the Greek paradigm that the contribution of performance art, in all of the different cases examined, lies in the disruption of the status quo and the interruption of the constructed ‘normality’ imposed in public spaces.

In Greece, an interventionist paradigm had already made its appearance in the 1970s, in the form of both installations and performances. Maria Karavela’s interventions in public squares, which took place after the fall of the Junta, were examined in Chapter 1.
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257 Areti Adamopoulou discusses a great number of installations in public space in Adamopoulou, 2000.
258 Dimitis Alithinos, Grigoris Semitekolo, Giannis Gaitis, Pavlos and Konstantinos Xenakis have also realised a number of public interventions in urban environments in the 1970s and 1980s. See Adamopoulou, 2000 and Irene Gerogianni. 2012. 'Χώρο-γραφίες του Πολιτικού: Ελληνικές Περιφρομάσεις του '70 και του '80 και Δημόσιος Χώρος' [Choro-graphies of the Political: Greek Performances of the 1970s and 1980s and Public Space] in Sarafianos Aris and Ioannou Panagiotis (eds) Πρακτικά 4ου Συνεδρίου Ιστορίας της Τέχνης: Ερευνητικά Ζητήματα στην Ιστορία της Τέχνης: Από τον Κάτω Μεσαίωνα μέχρι τις Μέρες μας [Proceedings of the 4th Conference of Art History: Research Issues in Art History: From the Late Middle Ages to Our Days (Asini).
the 1980s, a number of interventionist performances and happenings were performed outside of art institutions by the couple Alexandra Katsiani and Thanasis Chondros and by two collectives formed in the schools of fine art in Thessaloniki and Athens, named Katalipsi [Squat] and Karatransavanguardia (a name with ironic overtones, liberally translated as ‘uber-transavanguardia’, alluding to the term ‘transavanguardia’, or ‘transavantgarde’, coined by the Italian art critic Achille Bonito Oliva in 1979, referring to the Italian version of Neo-expressionism), respectively.259

Although both the Katsiani-Chondros duo and the two collectives engaged in innovative performative practices in public and semi-public spaces, they have been overlooked in histories of Greek art. Overall, public art—particularly in terms of performative practice—has been sidelined by Greek art historians and theorists, with only a few exceptions. To my knowledge, apart from a handful of books on public sculpture, there has been no published research that specifically examines the interaction between art and public space in Greece. The potentialities and limitations associated with public spaces in relation to art have never been the focus of historical research within the field of art. The traditional conservative approach to art history adopted within Greek institutions of higher education fosters formalism by emphasising the purely visual aspects of artworks and disregarding their historical and social context (an issue that is further discussed in Chapter 5). This, along with the fact that many Greek art historians study abroad and never return, can, at least partly, explain this specific gap in historical art research.

It was only after the mid-1990s that artists and institutions (and, partly, art historians) started exploring the conditions of public space in terms of artistic production in a more systematic and consistent manner.260 The socio-political conditions specific to Greece, along with the development of contemporary art, have contributed to the further study of public space with regard to both socio-economic factors and the artistic practices that are produced within its sphere. For instance, the increase in immigration, as a defining feature of Greece in the 1990s, and the process of gentrification that took place under the umbrella of the Olympic

259 ‘Transavanguardia/transavantgarde’, meaning beyond the avant-garde, marked a return to figurative and commercially appealing art that disdained conceptual art’s emphasis on intellect, social responsibility and anti-materialism. See Ann Lee Morgan. 2016. *Historical Dictionary of Contemporary Art* (Rowman and Littlefield), 271.

Games of 2004 have been determinants in the transformations that public spaces have undergone. The late 1990s also saw the emergence of an intensified interest in performative practices, as mentioned in the Introduction. It was inevitable that the roles of art, artists and audiences in relation to public space would have to be reconsidered. New art groups and collectives were formed and, along with many individual artists, organised and performed interventions in public spaces; these works examined, among other issues, the specificities of urban spaces and the tolerance in public space. These groups included Urban Void (1998-2006), the Filopappou Group (formed in 2001) and the Nomadic Architecture Network (formed in 2005). It has mainly been since the beginning of the twenty-first century, and particularly after 2008, that the subject of public space has come to receive increasing attention from artists and academics.

Significantly, the term public space does not only have positive connotations, namely those associated with communication, participation and/or democracy; it can also be associated with social control, censorship, surveillance and racism. As Deutche notes, ‘the term public frequently serves as an alibi under whose protection authoritarian agendas are pursued and justified’. Public space should therefore be considered as battlegrounds that are representative of all of the imposed and implied norms that pervade everyday life. The question is then how performance art should act in such a battleground: Should it comply with the norms, or should it resist them? And, furthermore, how does the public contribute to the production of performance?


262 An important exhibition in relation to public space was organised in May 1999. A group consisting of artists, filmmakers and architects, called ‘Diadromi 49’ [Route 49], conducted a series of artistic interventions downtown Athens. Documentation can be found at Avramidis Dimosthenis (ed.). 2000. Διαδρομή 49: Εικαστική Δράση στο Κέντρο της Αθήνας [Route 49: Visual Action at the Centre of Athens] (Lavirinthos). The growing interest in public space is also manifested by the several conferences that have taken place since the mid 2000s and particularly after 2008. To name but a few, in 2005 Aica organised in Athens the international conference Contemporary Art and Public Space, in 2008 the Chamber of Fine Arts in Greece also organised a conference under the same title. The Technical Chamber of Greece organised in 2011 the conference Searching for...Public Space [Δημόσιος Χώρος...Αναζητείται] while in 2014 Neon (a non-profit organisation that promotes contemporary art) planned two open discussions about contemporary art and public space. Furthermore, in 2016 the one day conference Performance Now v.5: What City? Performance, Public Space and Intervention [Performance Now v.5: Ποια πόλη; Performance, Δημόσιος Χώρος και Παρέμβαση] took place in Thessaloniki and in 2017 ISET (Institute of Contemporary Greek Art) organised a round table discussion on the theme of Art and Public Space.

When performance enters the public space, interaction with the place in question and the public is an inevitable outcome, due to performance’s physicality. Yet there are diverse ways in which such an interaction to be acknowledged or ignored, either through audience participation or the lack thereof. However, what does it mean to participate? And what does a refusal to participate signify? Usually, when people unexpectedly encounter a performance in a public space, there are three possible reactions: They may choose to become observers and watch, become involved (in either a beneficial or destructive manner) or ignore the event and pass it by. Keeping in mind that all such reactions influence the performance in terms of both its practice and meaning, in what follows I explore the diverse forms of interaction that result when performance enters the public sphere.

2. Mapping the Practice of Intervention: The Influence of Place and Identity

2.1 The Case of Alexandra Katsiani and Thanasis Chondros: Gestures and Rejections

The Katsiani-Chondros duo are an unusual case in the history of Greek performance art since they never studied art. Instead, they worked as philologists in secondary education, teaching modern and ancient Greek in state schools. Their performances were a result of their wish to act politically in a manner that was not obviously political. Although, in Greece, most artists before the 1990s, with very few exceptions, occasionally (and not exclusively) used their bodies as tools or media for their art, the couple consistently engaged in performative practices throughout their active years (1980-2004). Yet their contribution to contemporary art has only recently started to be acknowledged by art institutions and historians. Consequently, their work has not been adequately examined either historically or theoretically. The only extensive discussion of their work can be found in the PhD thesis of art historian and curator Areti Leopoulou, part of which was very recently published (in March 2017), as mentioned in the Introduction.
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264 The artists have supported a more performative approach of teaching that could be more influential and interesting for students. Interview with the author (25/1/2010).
265 Alexandra Katsiani-Thanasis Chondros, Interview with the author (25/1/2010).
266 In 2007 the first international performance festival (OPA) in Bios Athens and later in 2009 the first performance art festival in the framework Thessaloniki’s Biennale organised tributes to their work through documentation.
267 Leopoulou examines art practices in Greek contemporary art that relate to everyday life; her approach therefore does not set the focus on the medium of performance art or public space per se but on the connection between the duo’s art practices and the element of everyday life. See Leopoulou, 2017.
Their first public intervention, *The Meaning of a Gesture*, took place on the 5th of July 1981. The couple appeared at the entrance of the University of Patras on the final day of the first conference on the subject of Modern Greek poetry held in Greece. Having attended the conference, the artists mentioned that they had sat through a number of grandiose presentations and decided to participate in their own, more humorous and less pompous, way. Standing at the entrance to the conference building, they used plasters to seal their mouths shut and held bags that were full of small slices of bread. These bags had a sentence written on them: ‘The meaning of a gesture is the method of its affirmation’. They distributed the bread to the conference’ delegates shortly before its closing session.268

![Image of Alexandra Katsiani-Thanasis Chondros performing *The Meaning of a Gesture*](image)

**Figure 2.1:** Alexandra Katsiani-Thanasis Chondros, *The Meaning of a Gesture*, 1981, Performance, Patra.

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, a performative intervention in a public space inevitably entails interaction with an audience that may be unfamiliar with such contemporary art practices. Random bystanders would find it very difficult to consider such actions as a form of art, particularly in the Greece of the 1980s. Yet, in this case, the random

---

268 Interview with the author (25/1/2010).
viewers were a specific audience, the attendees of a poetry conference; this should imply that they had affinity for art in general and perhaps a familiarity with hidden meanings and unconventional gestures. Because of the place and the event that was ‘interrupted’, this performance-intervention was mentioned in the magazines and press that covered the conference.\textsuperscript{269} According to the media, the reactions were diverse; some of the well-known poets and writers who participated in the conference expressed disdain or indifference, treating the artists as if they were not there. The reaction of professor Andreas Dimarogonas, a member of the conference’s organising committee, was impressively hostile, as he arrived with two muscular men at his side and asked the artists to leave, claiming that they did not belong there and threatening to use violence. When the artists offered him some bread in response, he threatened to slap the female artist. According to the artists, the professor thought that somebody (related to a political party opposed to that which he supported) had sent them there to disrupt the ‘normality’ of the conference procedure.\textsuperscript{270} Overall, the delegates seemed surprised, while some of them approached the couple and expressed an interest in understanding what was happening. Another professor approached the artists and whispered to them that very few people would understand what they were doing. Finally, a journalist insisted on asking them questions regarding the meaning and the reasons of their action, despite their sealed mouths; he received no answer.

The first question that arises is why these symbolic actions invited such intense reactions. The intervention was not so much shocking as it was unusual and unexpected. The mere fact that it intervened in (or, as some would have it, interfered with) the normality of the progression of the conference’s programme was enough to provoke discomfort and even hostility. Would the reactions of these conference speakers be negative under any circumstances or did the connotations of this specific action provoke them? What was the purpose of such an intervention, and when was that purpose achieved, if at all? What is important when considering this specific performance is not only decoding the symbolic gestures used but also reflecting on the creation of an intersubjective space that provoked conflict as an outcome of the action.

The sealed mouths arguably stand as a metaphor for repressed speech, reversing the dominant ideas that we have about both poetry, a form of speech that may subvert the rules at any moment, and the university, an institution that is focused on exploratory speech and the

\textsuperscript{269} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{270} Ibid.
production of meaning. The offering of bread, on the other hand (which leads one to think of churches or funerals), is a practice seen in everyday life; yet, when placed outside of its ordinary context, its meaning can become confusing. If a performance requires interaction to actually form a structure and complete its meaning, the act of participation, or its refusal, should be seen as a vital aspect of the artwork.

In 1982, another performance by Katsiani and Chondros provoked even more intense and violent reactions. *The Circle* was performed during the Praxis Jazz Festival at the Goethe Institute in Athens, at the invitation of the festival’s organiser, Kostas Giannopoulos.²⁷¹ The couple dressed in white uniforms and sat at the entrance of the Institute, inside of a circle formed of seven hundred condoms. Inside this circle, they engaged in a traditional game that involves changing the shape of thread with hand movements. The festival audience had to pass by them to enter the concert hall. They had played the game for four hours when the action was interrupted by a viewer throwing a glass at them, hitting Chondros on the head.²⁷²

---

²⁷¹ Gianopoulos had read about the couple’s intervention at the poetry conference and invited them to participate in the festival.

²⁷² Katsiani and Chondros, Interview with the author (25/1/2010).
This time, the action could be considered as more provocative since the condoms (some of which looked used) were still a taboo subject in 1982, before the discovery of the HIV virus. While the first two hours passed with no strong reactions, later, some people attacked them verbally; they also walked on the condoms, broke the circle and entered the ‘private’ space the couple had created, standing extremely close to them.

The jazz festival was something new to Greece; it had been promoted at the time as an alternative and innovative event that would attract people who had a special interest in music. On these grounds, the artists thought that the night would be quiet and peaceful, but, instead, they experienced unexpected violent attacks. What is also indicative of the prevailing atmosphere around such contemporary art practices is the fact that in 1983, when the couple created an exhibition space in a flat, intended to accommodate both their own performances and those of other artists, they encountered difficulties in publishing the press release: The press refused to publicise the event. When they approached *Makedonia*, a mainstream paper published in northern Greece, they were told that people would not understand notions such as performance or action in space and that they should use the word ‘painting’ in their description.\(^ {273} \)

It becomes obvious that, in the case of the initial Katsiani-Chondros performances discussed above, during the early 1980s, random, yet art-related (in the broadest sense) audiences refused to accept such actions as art or had difficulty attributing meaning to such actions within an artistic framework. In the first case, the gesture was probably received as a mere political action, devoid of any artistic qualities, while the second performance was again not considered to be art, perhaps because of the challenges it posed in interpretation. The lack of formal documentation of these performances was not accidental; it was intended to contribute to the artists’ intrusion in the urban fabric as ‘common’ people who rejected the ‘aura’ of the artist. Katsiani and Chondros wished to destabilise the artist’s authority, which is, in a certain sense, confirmed and reinforced through the lenses of photographic and video cameras, and let those present react without imposing the concept of art on them.

\(^ {273} \) Ibid..
In 2005, when Evangelia Basdekis undertook her performance, the terms and conditions for performance art had already started changing in Greece (as discussed in Chapter 1), as indicated by the very reception of performative practices. The Locus Athens group organised an exhibition of performance art, under the title *7 Performances and a Conversation*, with the participation of six young Greek artists, each of whom was asked to conduct a performance at a place and time of their choice. The performances took place during a two-week period and were presented as part of an open exhibition; given the limitations and space restrictions of galleries, reaching out to the city of Athens seemed to offer an alternative art platform.\(^{274}\)

Evangelia Basdekis, one of the participating artists, completed a project under the title *Tama Art*, which imaginatively engaged with a type of pilgrimage associated with religious vows related to the Greek Orthodox Church. The Greek word *tama* refers to a sort of oath that is given by people to a specific saint in order to have their wishes fulfilled or to be cured of an illness or of a disorder. The most popular place of worship in Greece is a church on the island of Tinos; this site attracts many believers who are keen to turn their bodies into public spectacles of suffering by covering the distance from the port to the Panagia church on their hands and knees in order to express their humility, devotion and gratitude. As the asphalt road that rises up the hill to the church is rough and the pilgrims’ knees thus often start bleeding, a narrow red carpet has been placed alongside the asphalt road in order to lessen their suffering. The connection between faith and enduring the physical pain necessary to reach a desired ‘place’, whether it be in art or religion, is also addressed in Basdekis’s performance. Pilgrims deposit their material offerings, usually consisting of depictions of their wishes carved in precious metals (for instance, the depiction of a child, a house or even a limb), near a famous icon of the Virgin Mary that is considered miraculous, and their *tama* is fulfilled. In modern Greek, the phrase ‘I have promised a *tama*’ [έχω κάνει τάμα] is hardly uncommon, as it is used widely (if often with a hint of irony), even among non-believers, to suggest the extent and intensity of a desire that is unlikely to be fulfilled.

---

This admittedly rudimentary discussion of the word *tama* helps us to see that Basdekis’s performance would inevitably be considered to be charged with a spiritual significance for all of those familiar with this specific religious procession. Starting from Michalakopoulou Street in the centre of Athens, walking on her knees and hands, the artist ended up at the entrance of the imposing Megaro Mousikis, the Athens Concert Hall, which, at the time, also hosted the National Museum of Contemporary Art. With a crowd in her wake, the artist remained kneeling, in a position of prayer, outside the entrance to the temporary exhibition of the museum for approximately twenty minutes. As she observed, ‘people were quiet and solemn, like in a church, during the whole process, while afterwards they seemed really excited’.  

Viewers who were aware of the performance followed her silently, experiencing feelings of devoutness, whereas passers-by looked surprised and concerned, asking what was the matter, why this woman was on her knees and whether she was alright. After being told about the

---

275 Interview with the author (10/01/2010).
action, some opted to join the silent procession, perhaps out of curiosity, while others simply continued with their journeys. When the event was described to them as a work of art, by the art professionals that followed the artist, passers-by appeared to accept it as legitimate and acceptable, rather than irrational and unsettling. The participants in the performance stood silently in the museum, while the museum visitors, who also witnessed the action, were uncertain as to whether it was part of the museum’s exhibition or not. Either way, there was a tacit acknowledgement that, if something takes place within the territory of an art institution, it is art.

Basdekis undertook a similar performance in the UK. In Bristol, she covered the distance from the city’s cathedral to the Arnolfini Gallery. While the performances were designed and executed in the same manner at both locations, the experiences were utterly different for both the artist and the participants. The content and meaning of the later performance would inevitably be altered given the new context, as it took place before an audience unfamiliar with the Greek concept of the *tama* and the religious connotations associated with it. The relationship between the receiver and an art ‘object’ is particularised, and the consequent sense of the heightened interdependence of artist and viewer/participant affects an intriguingly changeable fusion of the two parties. As Amelia Jones argues,

> Body art proposes the art ‘object’ as a site where reception and production come together: a site of intersubjectivity. Body art confirms what phenomenology and psychoanalysis have taught us: that the subject ‘means’ always in relationship to others and the locus of identity is always elsewhere.277

When Basdeki’s performance took place in Bristol, the consequent interactions assumed a different quality. The sacred feeling of the Greek audience was absent. For this audience, who lacked background information and first-hand experience of the original cultural context, the artist’s pose and gestures were perceived differently. The element of chance also had a critical impact on the artist’s execution of this act. Some people’s behaviour became so disturbing and violent that the Gallery employees had to intervene in order to protect the artist, who continued the performance as planned. She arrived at the Gallery and assumed the

276 Ibid.
position of prayer for about twenty minutes, in complete silence, thus making a case for a
place for her work in art institutions.  

Image 2.4-2.5: Evagelia Basdekis, *TAMA ART*, 2005, Performance, Bristol.

Basdekis parodies the ‘art object’ while simultaneously presenting herself as an object, as a
museum exhibit, and/or a precious commodity claiming access to a coveted position within a
refined institution. She poses questions regarding how the position, status and role of the
artist are achieved, what the artist’s own participation entails, and the powerful effect wielded
by a work of art over its audience. Her use and interpretation of the concept of *tama*, a
promised offering in exchange of granting a wish by subverting a natural order, is ironic and
exposes her eagerness to be accepted by the institution as performance artist but also as
female artist, since research has shown that (at least up to 2009) the percentages of male
artists’ participation in exhibitions, in both museums and galleries, are still higher.  

The viewer becomes a participant—and, furthermore, an accomplice in the construction of
meaning that defies the possible—and a complex exchange of art production and reception is
facilitated and informed by the very particularity of all of the subjects who have a stake in
this constructive exchange. It is interesting, however, that the American Embassy, which is
situated immediately adjacent to the Athens Concert Hall, was not targeted by the artist. As is
well known to Athenians and others, all activity that takes place near the US Embassy (which
is, reportedly, the largest American Embassy in the Balkans) is recorded by satellite. A
historic and heavily policed institution that resembles a true fortress, the US Embassy in

Athens has been the destination for numerous protest rallies in Greece’s recent history.\textsuperscript{280} Because of the proximity of the American Embassy, the performance had the potential to acquire a different significance and meaning.

As the artist has explained, the fact that the American Embassy was on her way did not preoccupy her since her idea of the performance did not relate to it. She had only chosen the specific route because of the traffic lights that would help her cross safely the road. Yet the specific route had indeed an impact on the performance. As Basdekis was crossing the road, some of the viewers-participants reached the Embassy before she did. One of the guards in the Embassy asked what the occasion was and told the viewers that they could not walk on the sidewalk in front of the embassy as it is private property; they would need official permission to do so. One of the viewers, Giorgos Divaris, who is a professor at the School of Fine Arts in Thessaloniki, tried to clarify to the guard that the event was just an artistic performance and nothing more. Emphasising his professional status, Divaris tried hard to convince him that the performance was realised under the aegis of both the University of Thessaloniki and the National Museum of Contempoary Art towards which the artist was heading; a fact that was not true since Basdeks’s visit to the museum was not pre-announced. Divaris kept stressing that the event had nothing to do with the Embassy. When the artist

\textsuperscript{280} See, Athens Embassy, \url{https://athens.usembassy.gov/} [accessed 10/12/2016].
reached the guard, he pointed his gun at her while at the same time more guards gathered around. Finally, they let the artist and the viewers pass in front of the Embassy. Basdekis intention was to address the institutions of art, yet her performance was unexpectedly transformed into a confrontation with the authorities.

It is not only the viewer’s identity and subjectivity but also the constructed identity of a place that determine both the manner in which a performance is realised and how meaning or the dynamics of perception/reception are produced. As David Harvey argues, ‘the elaboration of place-bound identities has become more rather than less important in a world of diminishing spatial barriers to exchange, movement and communication’. In *Lure of the Local, Senses of Place in a Multicentered Society*, Lucy Lippard defines place as

> temporal and spatial, personal and political. A layered location replete with human histories and memories, place has width as well as depth. It is about connections, what surrounds it, what formed it, what happened there, what will happen there… [place is] the external world mediated through human subjective experience.

Lippard believes, however, that the expansion and transformation of capitalism has influenced distinctive local differences and cultures and that the particularity of places is thus continually being homogenised. Yet, as stressed above, different places can indeed imbue the same art action with different meanings. Moreover, it should be noted that capitalism is not fostering homogeneity anymore. On the contrary it is diversity and individualised experience that capitalism invests in. It is exactly the particularity of places and identities, and cultural differences, especially in relation to the art market and the art institution overall that capitalism is endorsing. In *Art Incorporated: The Story of Contemporary Art*, Julian Stallabrass illustrates the proliferation of international Biennales and other art events across the world since the 1990s that promote cultural difference and aim to attract a wide range of both artists and audiences. Similarly, as Stallabras notes, museums build alliances with corporations, bring their products closer to mainstream culture and become more like theme

---
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parks so as to engage new and diverse audiences. Heterogenity then has become the latest target of capitalism. As Miwon Kwon argues,

What Lippard’s thinking misses are Lefebvre’s important insights on the dialectical rather than oppositional relationship between the increasing abstraction of space and the production of particularities of place, local specificity, and cultural authenticity—a concern that informs many site-oriented art practices today.\footnote{Miwon Kwon, One Place after Another, Site Specific Art and Locational Identity, 159.}

The particularities of place in relation to collective memory also function as a determinant in the next performance to be discussed. The contingency of an artwork’s meaning in relation to the viewer and the body functioning to disrupt the urban environment are also evident in the work of Georgia Sagri. On the 17th of November 1999, in her Polytechneio performance, the artist stood still for three hours in a glass container, wearing only bandages in place of underwear, opposite the historic main entrance to the National Technical University of Athens; this performance took place during political demonstrations intended to commemorate the students’ riots against the Junta in 1973.\footnote{As was discussed in Chapter 1, the Athens Polytechnic uprising in 1973 was a massive demonstration of popular rejection of the Greek military Junta of 1967-1974. The uprising began on 14 November 1973, escalated to an open anti-Junta revolt and ended in bloodshed in the early morning of November 17 after a series of events starting with a tank crashing through the gates of the Polytechnic.} Using bandages, perhaps as a reference to wounds, and placing her naked body in a glass container that could refer either to a cage or the window of a shop, the artist challenged not only the limits of her personal and physical endurance, but also, and more crucially, the boundaries of the socially acceptable by exploring the spectrum of tolerance in a society of control and repression of civil liberties.
Most of the random viewers felt awkward when confronted with the image of a half-naked woman trapped inside a glass container. Inevitably, many questions were raised regarding the action, and many discussions related to the seven years of dictatorship followed. For the artist, the meaning and purpose of her performance was to generate debate around the themes of democracy and human rights. The performance’s intention of provoking confrontation was reinforced by the fact that Sagri was taken to court and charged with scandalous behaviour and immoral actions. Restricted and near-naked, in a country where freedom of speech and expression are considered a given, the artist commemorated the deprivation of liberties that took place during the Junta, yet she was arrested under terms reminiscent of censorship in 1999.

2.3 Bodies Unequal: Public Space and Social Control

In 2008, the Greek-American artist Paul Zografakis reactivated an empty, dilapidated storefront in Athens (at Kyrillou Loukareos, near the Ambelokipi metro station),

287 Georgia Sagri, interview with the author (13/7/2010).
289 She was later disposed of charges. Ibid.
transforming it into an alternative and experimental art space for a month. The project-space was called Καφενεόν [Kafeneon], and its activities consisted more or less of coffee brewing, lectures, and exhibitions. Καφενεόν served free Greek coffee to passers-by ‘as a mechanism to entice visitors who would likely never enter an art space’.290

On the final day of the Καφενεόν project, video projections by international artists, as well as live performances, drew a huge crowd. Among that day’s (the 31st of March) performances was Hymn of Freedom. This performance was conceived and organised by Jennifer Nelson, an artist and tutor at the American College of Greece, and artist Toby Short, but it was executed by approximately twenty randomly chosen immigrants (legal or otherwise). The immigrants were from Albania, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Ivory Coast, Malaysia, New Zealand, Sierra Leone, the United Kingdom and the US. Specifically, the participants were Giorgos Mosko (Albania), Rosina Ivanova (Bulgaria), Abdullah Amarkil (Afghanistan), Airini Konstantinidou (Malaysia), Loretta McCauley and Pat Ogbodu (Sierra Leone), Sandra (Ghana), Konate Mamadou (Ivory Coast), Theophile Yerbanga (Burkina Faso), Hugo PaeWhite (New Zealand), Jennifer Nelson and Keith Moore (USA)—a composer who provided some assistance with the singing practice—Toby Short and John Bicknell (UK), Abdur Rahim, Monirul Islam, Ahmed Masuk, Abdur Razzak, Hossain Khan and Abdul Quddus (all from Bangladesh) and two Greeks, Elina Dimitriadi—who stated that she felt like a stranger in her own country—and Pelagia Mourouzi, who did not sing or sit in the room but led people near to the entrance and prompted them to go inside.

The immigrants were invited to sing the Greek national anthem as part of the performance. They were given a hand-out with the Greek text and rehearsed the anthem for several weeks in Nelson’s studio, where they also shared food, spent time together and got to know each other. Most of them could not understand the meaning of the Greek words, but they all learned to sing the anthem with pride. On the day of the performance, all of the participants, along with Nelson and Short, were subjected to an unusual procedure: They were all crammed into an extremely small room, into which they barely fitted, and were forced to wait

290 Paul Zografakis, interview with Georgia Kotretsos, ‘Inside the Artist’s Studio: Paul Zografakis’, art21 magazine (2 July 2010), http://blog.art21.org/2010/07/02/inside-the-artists-studio-paul-zografakis/#.VWcr-MeDGc [accessed 28/1/15]. The lectures were arranged every Wednesday with topics ranging from BBQ and Ballet to Conflict Resolution in Africa and Professional Wrestling. The first exhibition show consisted of ten artists while the second one was a solo show with a large scale installation. The final show consisted of international videos and live performances. For more details on the project see also Tereza Papamichali, ‘Beautiful Like an American. Καφενεόν Project Space Athens 14-18 March 2008’ in Kaput. 01, http://www.kaput.gr/en/wpaoi-san-amepikanoi [accessed 18/1/15] and http://artzog.com/kafeneon [accessed 18/1/15].
for about two hours before their performance. A number of performances were scheduled for that night, and they were confined to the room while they waited for their turn. Their confinement was part of the work process. Visitors to the art space could peek into the small room as part of their tour of the premises; they were also invited to enter the room and spend some time with the participants. To do so, they had to physically squeeze themselves into the narrow space, meaning that their bodies would unavoidably come into contact with the other participants’ bodies. Some of the viewers accepted the invitation, while others declined. The atmosphere in the room, in spite of the cramming, was friendly and jovial. Each of the participants carried a carte de visite with their names and accounts of their experiences in Greece; they distributed the card to those who entered the room.  

Figure 2.9: Jennifer Nelson and Toby Short, Hymn to Freedom, 2008, Participatory Performance, Athens.

291 The information about the performance was given to me by Jennifer Nelson, Toby Short and one of the participants, Rosina Ivanova.
When the time came, they exited καφενεον and, facing the Supreme Court, they pompously sang the Hymn to Freedom, as if addressing the court. Traffic stopped, and people watched. After finishing the hymn, they stood still for several minutes. Back inside, the project continued, with the immigrants mingling with the crowd, introducing themselves and handing out the visiting cards with their names and stories. One of the cards said ‘I have no papers. No job. I can’t get my residence permission done. I love singing. I have been here for 7 years. The rose is more beautiful in Bangladesh’ and another ‘The thing I miss most since coming to Greece is the person I once was, who believed my dreams might find a place’.

The recruitment of the participants was also a major part of the project. Nelson and Short met with various people and asked friends of friends to refer possible participants. They also visited the Bangladesh Doel Cultural Organization, where, according to Nelson, people were incredibly gracious and generous, and contacted the United African Women Organization, headed by Loretta McCauley, an activist who works with/for second-generation immigrants, some of whom also participated in the project. Everyone involved in the project volunteered, either because they believed in the necessity of making their existence known and having the opportunity to communicate or simply because they wanted to be part of a larger community, rather than existing in a kind of ghetto.

---


293 The information was given to me by Jennifer Nelson in a discussion we had via email (May-June 2015).
The involvement of ‘minorities’ in artistic projects has been quite popular in Western art over the last twenty years or so. Particularly during the last decade, the issue of immigration has concerned a number of Greek artists, who have attempted to emphasise its urgency through several projects and performances. Refugees and immigrants living in Greece were, and still are, largely made to feel invisible. This invisibility does not only refer to their illegal status but their existence as part of a society as well. According to Nelson, this is perhaps the reason why the Bangladesh Doel Cultural Organization treated the artists with great respect and as if their involvement signalled a change of attitude on the part of Greek society, while, in reality, they were ‘two poor artists with very limited influence’. The mere fact that the artists intended to attract positive attention to the issues posed by immigration and to offer marginalised individuals the chance to partake in a social and artistic event became a key factor in the immigrants’ eagerness to participate.

The ramifications and problems posed by the surge in the number of immigrants have most commonly been discussed by the media and the vast majority of politicians strictly in relation to the host country and its residents, while the difficulties the immigrants and refugees face themselves have been of secondary or no importance whatsoever. The culmination of such attitudes was the creation of detention camps, the living conditions in which are deplorable. It is a fact that immigrants who seek to make Greece their home confront many obstacles legally and socially, if, that is, they manage to survive the ordeal of their ‘illegal’ trip.

Nelson and Short’s project set the focus on the problems immigrants face when coming to Greece, not the problems faced by Greek society that are typically associated with the greater influx of immigrants. The project was an effort to reveal the hidden aspects of the lives of people who have been treated as an amorphous mass, with their identities as immigrants having eclipsed any claim to individuality. The first point to be noted with regard to this
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294 To name but a few cases in which artists involve minorities, Thomas Hirschhorn collaborated with socially marginalised people living in a mixed Turkish-German social housing complex for the Bataille Monument, Santiago Sierra has frequently used immigrants in his projects, the collective Wochenklausur have also worked with homeless people, drug-addicted women and immigrants.

295 To name but a few: Leda Papaconstantinou, In the Name of (2007), Marios Spiliopopulos, Human Trace (2008), Art Group Savra along with a number of other artists (curated by Marina Fokidis) Egnatia Road: A Path of Displaced Memories (2005 in Greece), Marios Chatziprokopiou My name is Hassan (2012), Alexandros Plomaritis Leave your Myth in Greece(2012).

296 The information was given to me by Jennifer Nelson in a discussion we had via email (May-June 2015).

project is that it involved the formation of an ephemeral community through singing, despite
the fact that the song used reflected the reality that the participants were, in fact, alienated as
a result of being in a foreign and mostly unwelcoming land and having to grapple with a new
language. As one of the participants explained, this project offered foreigners a space in
which they could meet other people. Many immigrants spend months in their host countries
without talking to anyone. Sharing experiences in the context of the project offered the
possibility of making new friends, socialising or belonging somewhere, even if temporarily.

Although one would expect that the lack of space and ‘forced’ proximity of the bodies, as a
result of their being crammed into such a small room, would lead to tension and discomfort—
consider the interior of a crammed bus or underground coach—it did not. On the contrary, as
mentioned previously, the ambience was friendly and cheerful, and people felt comfortable
with each other. They talked and laughed while waiting. That is likely because of the context
in which the cramming took place, namely the art project. Of course, there were also viewers
who were reluctant to participate in the ‘getting to know you’ process and avoided entering
the room.

Artistic practices that involve the use of specific communities or minorities may invite
criticism on ethical grounds. The specific project bears evident resemblances to Santiago
Sierra’s controversial delegated performances where immigrants are hired to perform peculiar
tasks such as to remain covered in insulating foam, have their hair bleached, remain still,
hidden inside a cardboard box or in a humid, hot compartment in a ship under the sun. Such
performances are marked by sensations of unease and discomfort exactly because they
expose the conditions of ‘bare life’, as discussed by philosopher Giorgio Agamben, that the
exile bodies and subjectivities of immigrants experience.298 There have been concerns
expressed regarding the ‘exploitation’ of these people’s suffering in the name of art, as
already discussed in Chapter 1. Claire Bishop has noted that the ‘social turn’ in contemporary
art has given rise to an ethical turn in art criticism, meaning that artists are judged by their

Publics (Routledge). See also Giorgio Agamben. 1998. Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life
[Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen] (Stanford University Press).
working processes and criticised for the ways in which they collaborate with marginalised communities or individuals and the degree to which they ‘exploit’ them.\footnote{Claire Bishop. 2006. ‘The Social Turn: Collaboration and its Discontents’, \textit{ArtForum}, 180. The complex interfaces which have emerged between ethics, aesthetics, and politics in recent art practices were explicitly examined in the exhibition \textit{Social Documents/The Ethics of Encounter} at Stills Gallery in Edinburgh curated by art historian and curator Kirsten Lloyd. See also Lloyd’s essay ‘The Ethics of Encounter’ published in \textit{Artpulse} magazine, Summer 2011, \url{http://www.stills.org/sites/default/files/TheEthicsofEncounter_Artpulse.pdf} [accessed 25/6/2016].}

Nelson and Short’s delegated performance also featured an ironic dimension: The immigrants sang Greece’s national anthem while facing the High Court of a country that does not provide the same freedoms and rights to all of its residents (not that any other country does). The artists and organisers of the act were also foreigners; however, some foreigners are more welcome than others, depending on their country of origin and wealth. The inclusion of immigrant bodies does not reflect their treatment in the public sphere or space. On the contrary, when a foreign body is exposed as such in a public space, it is often humiliated and deprived of citizen rights. The next performance discussed sets the focus precisely on the reception of the immigrant body in public space and reveals the consequences of not having a space where a public intervention can be ratified as art. While the designation ‘art’ offers some kind of protection within an art space (even if that protection is temporary), the artist’s body is exposed and may be threatened when performing in the public space.

Rosina Ivanova, one of the participants in \textit{Hymn to Freedom}, is a Bulgarian performance artist who lives and works in Athens. Most of her early work can be perceived as an exploration of the interaction of the foreign body with public spaces and is permeated with biographical elements. In 2011, she participated in the Photography as Performance Festival (curated by Dimosthenis Agrafiotis), part of the Athens Photo Festival, with her performance \textit{LAZARKA to Wilder Woman: Bulgaria, Lovech—Greece, Porto Rafti, From one Place to Another, Here within Elsewhere}. In her personal adaptation of the traditional Bulgarian ritual called \textit{Lazarka}, which is associated with Lazarus Day, the artist invited the audience to participate in a 43 km walk that lasted over eight hours. In this Bulgarian folk ritual, young peasant girls, dressed in their national attire, go around village houses to collect eggs to dye for Easter. The girls carry baskets and knock on the villagers’ doors, offering to perform an action of their choosing—such as singing, dancing, etc—in exchange for which they are offered eggs. In some villages, \textit{lazarki} do not only visit houses but also greet people with
songs in the street, at crossroads, outside of churches and so on. Walking and communicating with random people on the streets were also to be the core of Ivanova’s performance.

Although the performance was curated and performed within the context of a festival taking place inside of a gallery, the artist performed the walk alone. She intended to walk 43 km, from the Technopolis Museum through the centre of Athens to the Love Cave beach at the Porto Rafti resort near Athens, which she did, after some distractions. The route was chosen because it connected the two sides of the city. Her pace was normal and her outfit ordinary so as to not attract attention. Prior to the walk, Ivanova had knitted flowers in lengthy lines and rings to hand out to passers-by. She set off from the Technopolis Museum at approximately nine o’clock and continued through the heart of the city, Ermou Street and Vassilisis Sofias, when, after about eight kilometres, she was stopped at Zografou district at approximately ten o’clock by policemen in civilian clothes, who asked her what she was doing, where she was going and why she was walking in the street. Because of their ordinary attire and aggressive attitude, the artist feared they might have been members of the fascist party Golden Dawn. After she insisted on their presentation of their police IDs, they, surprised and offended, briefly showed her a card that was blurry as a result of its plastic coating. They then demanded her ID and residence permit. After forty minutes of questioning in the street, more policemen arrived—in uniform this time. Despite the fact that Ivanova showed them her Bulgarian ID, they took her to the police station. The question here is how did the police know that she was a foreigner? The artist overheard a phone conversation between the police officers, in which they said that they have ‘the girl that has been walking from the city centre’, which suggests that she had been followed. They forced her to delete all of the photographs she had taken during the walk and turn her camera off, even after she explained that they were all related to her art project and suggested that they contact her curator to confirm her status as an artist or check Facebook for the details of the project. The moment that Facebook was mentioned, the policemen not only failed to be convinced of her art-related intentions but also became concerned about the number of people involved in this suspicious activist undertaking. They specifically stated that they wanted to check her camera because spies sometimes have ways of hiding evidence. They also checked her bag and found
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300 For further information see Mercia MacDermott. 1998. Bulgarian Folk Customs (Jessica Kingsley Publishers).
301 In 2011 the attacks on immigrants was a very common and frequent practice for members of the Golden Dawn.
it suspicious that she was carrying two different maps of the city. None of her explanations satisfied the police, who took her to the police station to check if she had an impending court appointment. She was held at the station for five hours, with the excuse of a malfunctioning computer system (‘the system went down’) being given. During her stay in a tiny office, she met over sixteen police officers as shifts changed and had to explain to all of them the reasons for her walk. The procedure was familiar to her, as she had been dragged to police stations for identification several times previously. She was also asked questions in connection with her presence in Greece, her studies and life. They persistently asked her how she managed to study and how she funded her studies. After her release, she continued the walk but ended her journey about eleven kilometres short of her final destination because of exhaustion.302

Ivanova’s performance addressed issues of borders, identities and control and raised questions regarding the accessibility of so-called public space and the legitimacy of art as a form of labour within that space. Her national identity affected the evolution of, and produced a meaning for, her performance. It is obvious that, had Ivanova been Greek or a tourist in Greece, none of the above would have happened. The unexpected (or perhaps not so unexpected) police interference in the performance of this art project serves as confirmation of the reality that borders do not only delimit the territory of countries but define bodies as well.

As she was identified as being an immigrant, rather than just foreign, Ivanova’s body became a subject to be questioned when she entered the public realm. The authority of the artist has no power whatsoever when alienated from specific artistic frameworks. It is interesting to note the similarities and differences of Ivanova’s walking project to Jenny Marketou’s ‘migratory’ art project Translocal realised between 1996 and 2001 in Polk County, Florida, New York City, Mexico City, Rotterdam, Jerusalem, Ramallah, Snag Harbo, Staten Island, New London, Connecticut, Düsseldorf, Nicosia, Bialystok and Tijuana.303 Translocal was a performative work that invited reflection on migration as Ivanova’s project also did. The project consisted of two parts: a performative public intervention, where Marketou

302 Rosina Ivanova, Interview with the author (19/12/2014).
303 Jenny Marketou is an artist that, as Angela Dimitrakaki notes, belongs to a group of artists, or, more general cultural workers who are described as ‘living between’. The artist lives between New York, where she came to study in the 1980s, and Athens, where she was born and raised. She is known as a new media artist and has integrated travel in her work since the early 1990s. See Angela Dimitrakaki. 2013. Gender, Artworks and the Global Imperative (Manchester University Press), 128-129. See also Jenny Marketou Website, http://www.jennymarketou.com/works.html [accessed 29/3/2017].
(accompanied by a camera-woman) set up her tent for a few days in public spaces, such as parks, squares, streets and border zones, in the cities mentioned above (without obtaining a formal permission of the authorities) and an installation, namely a tent positioned inside the space of the cultural institution the artist would happen to collaborate with. As Angela Dimitrakaki notes, besides ‘the project’s anthropological imperative enabling a comparative approach to public space, Translocal interrogated also into the assumed gap separating the “protected” institutional site and “the square”’. Marketou noted that ‘the events which took place’ in each location made her conscious of the translocal ‘importance of a gendered public space’ although this was not her intention when she was preparing the project. In New York City the artist chose Central Park as the location for her intervention. The moment she had finished setting up her tent, police officers obliged her and the camera-woman to take it down immediately. They informed her that it is against the law to set up dwellings in public space. They were therefore caught in an illegal act and seen probably as an unidentified potential threat just because she performed an unusual act or as Dimitrakaki put it because ‘their place in Central Park lacked evident purpose, therefore meaning, but at least they were women and so unlikely to prove violent or cause trouble’. The artist’s gender in this case has been a defining factor in the perception of her work in some cases. Being a woman influenced the manner in which people interpreted her presence and use of public space. In Ramallah, men began to crowd around her as she was setting up her tent in the Central Market Square, assuming she was a prostitute while in Rotterdam as she was setting up her tent in Keilweg, a red light district, she was attacked by pimps who thought she was an independent prostitute. The police intervened and not only allowed her to set up her tent on their security boat, but also helped her with the poles and tarps. Her experience with the police and public space in Rotterdam was therefore utterly different from the one in New York and from the one Ivanova had in Athens. In contradiction to the case of Ivanova, Marketou’s revelation that she was an artist appeared to carry the similar weight to her gender with respect to how her performance was perceived. Both Ivanova’s Lazarka and Marketou’s Translocal reveal the complicated association between artistic labour and the institutions of art. In the case of Marketou, as Dimitrakaki argues, ‘the perceived autonomy

304 Dimitrakaki, 2013, 130.
305 Ibid.
306 Ibid., 131.
308 Dimitrakaki, 2013, 131.
of the artist’s choices (where to go) is apparently predicated on the global availability of institutional mediation that aids each of the project’s situated incarnations and permits only a certain degree of unpredictability as regards their outcomes—and does this institutional anchor also premise greater safety for the women artist?  

The answer to this question can be both positive, as in the case of Marketou in Rotterdam, and negative as in the case of Ivanova since being an artist was not acknowledged as a legitimate occupation by the police—or, rather, the artist’s national identity and immigrant status overrode her artistic identity. When Ivanova insisted that she was actually working and had to be in Porto Rafti at a specific time, she was ignored. In contrast to the performance in Καφενεον, where the artistic space and audience provided a framework that defined the outcome of the artistic process, in this case the absence of the art institution as an immediately visible framework made art indistinguishable from life. Her artistic labour was lost from sight in the context of life, which was shown to be a register of social antagonisms and fairly specific hierarchies, rather than a space of unlimited possibilities. The ‘chance encounter’ once animating the French surrealists’ walks in the city and the militant reclamation of urban space performed later on by the Situationists proved to be impossible achievements for Ivanova. Indeed, the chance encounter was precisely reversed as a non-chance encounter with the police.  

Globally, artists have focused on the issues of borders and cultural diversity. Ivanova’s walking performance bears certain resemblances to Yayoi Kusama’s Walking Piece, performed in New York in 1966. Dressed in a traditional kimono and carrying an umbrella decorated with plastic flowers, the Japanese artist strolled through the streets of abandoned New York industrial environments. What the two performances share is the notion and feeling of foreignness. Yet, while Kusama deliberately used an exotic outfit to emphasise her alien presence in a Western city, Ivanova did not stress either her foreign identity or her artistic status. Had she worn the Lazarka attire or had a crowd following her, the nature of the police involvement may have been different. Yet the artist’s intention was precisely to avoid standing out; she wished to blend into the flows of the city—its repetitive everydayness—without bearing any marker of distinctiveness.
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309 Ibid., 134.
Ivanova’s performance may constitute an answer to artist Krzysztof Wodiczko’s question ‘where are we today regarding democracy with relation to art? How can art influence and be influenced by the process of democracy?’—or the lack of democracy, one might add. There is an impression that Europe is open, free and pleasant to live in, but this is not the case for specific groups of people, as it is well known. Political arrangements have made it very clear that the abolition of borders and the distribution of democracy do not apply to everyone. The Schengen Treaty (Europa, 2009) blocks the entry of political refugees and economic migrants seeking asylum or a better life in other countries in order to ‘protect’ the European space. By law, ‘illegal’ immigrants and refugees cannot leave European countries or stay within them; people without papers are deprived of their identities and thus live, trapped, in a place where they do not legally exist. The crux of Ivanova’s performance is that it subverts the definition of public space as a domain that promotes democratic processes and is open to anyone who wishes to join ‘the public’. The confrontation with the police reinforced the artwork’s power and potentiality to complete its political mission.

3. Integration as Intervention

While the works discussed so far have examined the power of intervention to interrupt or break continuity, in this section I consider performative projects that feature a different approach to intervention, namely the employment of parasitical behaviour on the part of the artist. In 2005, Mary Zygouri became the organiser and co-ordinator of the collaborative project Hacking Reality, which was developed for the 7 Performances and a Conversation exhibition organised by the Locus Athens group, as mentioned previously. The performance was realised by a group of street cleaners who worked for the Municipality of Athens. On the day of the performance, a crowd gathered at the centre of Theatrou Square in central Athens, where a leaflet containing the semaphore alphabet (the flag-based code primarily used by ships to communicate at a distance) was distributed. Half an hour later, three road-sweeping vehicles appeared at the three exits of the square, surrounding the crowd, and sprayed them

with a liquid that had a fresh-smelling aroma. After the vehicles were used to force the viewers into a dense mass, four refuse collectors climbed down from the vehicles and stood in front of the public, holding the semaphore flags aloft. Using the semaphore flag signalling system, they communicated the phrase ‘Within a structure. Outside a structure’ to the crowd, which was expected to respond after decoding the message using the leaflet provided.  
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313 Locus Athens, *7 Performances and a Conversation* (Futura), 116.
The artist undertook the duties of a performance educator/trainer for a month and became the coordinator of the final performance. Both the artist and the cleaners who participated voluntarily adopted different identities for a certain period of time, with the former assuming the role of an educator and director, while the latter became producers of a work of art. What is also interesting is the artist’s intervention in the cleaners’ everyday life through the form of regular meetings and discussions on art in general and on the project specifically, and her endeavour to adopt the role of mediator in their encounter with contemporary art. At this point, it is important to stress the defining role that institutions play in such performances. According to the artist, it would have been impossible to realise such a participatory performance without the support of the institutions that allowed her to access the specific working space, despite the cumbersome bureaucratic procedures she had to follow.

Zugouri’s intervention in the workplace of the cleaners draws connections to ‘the sanitation aesthetics’ of Mierle Laderman Ukeles. In 1976, Ukeles collaborated with 300 maintenance workers for her project I Make Maintenance Art One Hour Every Day. The artist, in a similar way to Zugouri’s approach to the cleaners, spent five weeks approaching workers, photographing them and asking them to classify what they were doing at that time as work or art. She used herself as a channel to give the maintenance workers access to

artistic authority, again as the Greek artist did introducing the cleaners to concepts of contemporary art. In *Touch Sanitation* (1978), Ukeles shook the hand of 8,500 sanitation workers, saying ‘Thank you for keeping New York City alive’ to each one of them. Again, as in the case of Zygouri, Ukeles engaged with the sanitation workers in conversations about their workdays, everyday life and personal stories. Yet Ukeles in this project was also concerned about the racism the cleaners face. In their discussions, the workers revealed the terrible names that people call them and Ukeles used them for a new project in which after writing them all on long panels of two-story glass windows, she invited 190 guests, representing all sectors of society, to wash the names off of the seventy-five feet glass. Zygouri’s project on the other hand, did not reveal any intention to focus on the discrimination the cleaners might face in Greece. She rather focused on their participation in the creative artistic process. Yet the projects of both artists demonstrate both feminist and class-conscious orientation and address the unacknowledged labour of sanitation and domesticity. The performative interventions of both Ukeles and Zygouri serve as ‘a fundamental link to a larger socio-political consciousness on the role of maintenance in sustaining human welfare’.

Such an approach to intervention is also apparent in her work *Parasite: Phoney Utopia, STAR-Porno-Cinema* (2004) realised with the collaboration of individuals who worked at a pornographic cinema in Omonoia Square, downtown Athens. The artist developed a relationship with the employees who worked there over the course of a three-month project. She undertook the duties of the cashier, gained access to the cinema’s archive and familiarised herself with the environment. She was not allowed to take pictures; therefore, she kept a diary. In this case, however, due to a lack of institutional support, her concept could not be realised as originally planned. Her original idea was to replace the board that displayed upcoming film releases with works of her own and project one of her video works unexpectedly during a screening or to herself perform an action in front of the viewers. This could not be accomplished since the owner of the cinema demanded hefty financial compensation for altering the cinema’s programme and the consequent loss of sales. Hence, with the cinematic background of an American orgy but without the presence of cinemagoers, Zygouri attempted to balance on a seesaw while holding a thermometer in her mouth. The
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action ended when the thermometer reached the ‘right’ temperature and rang an alarm; then, the action would resume.317

In each of the above cases, the interventions feature a consensual character, in marked contrast to the performances discussed in the first section of this chapter. Zygouri appears to infiltrate places and processes where one would not expect to encounter an artist and to do so while functioning as a ‘chameleon’ or a ‘parasite’. Her take on the interactions between art and the spaces and temporalities of everyday life entails a series of innovative adjustments to a variety of environments, in the course of which she observes and participates in others’ (namely sanitation workers, and the customers and employees of a pornographic cinema) performed roles as she engages them in her performance of ‘being an artist’. Interestingly, the sites she chooses to enter are, in most cases, male-dominated work environments, in which antagonism and authoritarian relationships exist.

Zygouri’s interventions activate an identity game not only for the participants but also for the spaces upon which she intrudes. Her identity as an artist generates confusion in these specific work spaces and indeed highlights their specificities. The intention appears to be the production of a new space that is devoid of its original properties and imbued with a destabilised identity. The outcome of such an action, however, does not always meet the artistic intention. While, in the case of the public service performance, reality was indeed hacked and destabilisation was achieved in the name of art, in the case of the porn cinema,

317 Mary Zygouri, Interview by the author (9/01/2010).
the artist partly ‘failed’ to impose her artistic identity, while her gender provoked greater bewilderment. As she explains, all of the employees and cinemagoers looked at her in great surprise not because she was an artist (the visitors were unaware of that) but because she was a woman. The male gaze transformed her from a subject that produces art into a subject that produces confusion by her presence. On the other hand, her ‘invasion’ turned the viewers of a porn cinema into participants in an art project, which, however, they did not seem to acknowledge. The authority of the artist was again disputed, and her unexpected presence in a porn cinema, a gender-defined space, provoked a disruption as a result of her gender, not her artistic labour. In contrast, in the Theatrou Square performance, which was realised with the support of multiple non-art institutions, the participants acknowledged Zygouris’s artistic identity and were willing to disengage themselves from their everyday duties and participate in an art event.

4. Collective Intervention: Occupation and Transformation of Public Space

Beyond interventions by individual artists, there have also been collective interventions that aimed to promote an alternative utilisation of public space. Collectivism in art has been explored since at least the 1920s in the Greek art scene. Several groups of visual artists, in some cases collaborating with architects, psychologists and sociologists, among others, were formed between the 1960s and 1980s. Collective interventions were realised in the late 1980s by the Katalipsi [Squat] and Karatransavaguardia groups, who undertook actions intended to promote better conditions for the development of contemporary art, which had been sidelined for many years in Greece.

The context in which the work of such collectives took place merits attention. In the mid-1980s, as the Greek middle class was expanding, a generation of artists with political
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318 The Male gaze is a term discussed by Laura Mulvey in her essay ‘Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema’ (1975)
demands forged a new approach to art and audiences, one that did not enjoy any institutional support. Their political claims were not related to specific political parties but to a leftist ideology that intended to place art outside of the art market. Through their actions, which included the occupation of disused buildings, they demanded new operating conditions for state art schools and ‘greater respect’ for contemporary art.

The School of Fine Arts in Athens was established in 1837 as part of the Polytechnic School; in 1930, it became an independent institution of higher education. In Thessaloniki, the School of Fine Arts was established as part of the Aristotle University in 1984. Yet the operating conditions in both art schools were, at the very least, unacceptable. The lack of adequate studio and teaching facilities was a major problem, while, in Thessaloniki, the space provided consisted of slipshod precast shacks made of aluminium and fibreglass. In addition, there was much controversy concerning the appointment of academic staff and, to an extent, the selection of students. The perceived absence of meritocracy and the questionable procedures by which staff were elected to tenured posts corroborated views that the founding of the School was characterised by systemic corruption and nepotism. These lamentable conditions were indicative of the overall neglect of art education by the state.

The Katalipsi group was formed in 1986 when art students decided to occupy a precast building that belonged to the School of Education, but had remained unused, and work there. The art students participated in protest actions as part of the occupation. In 1987, they wrapped the statue of Alexandros Papanastasiou in white sheet, founder of Thessaloniki’s Aristotle University, to spare ‘him’ the ordeal of watching the decline of the institution that was his life’s work. Another happening took place during the opening day of the second Biennale of Young Artists from Europe and the Mediterranean in Thessaloniki, which was attended by the then Minister of Culture, Melina Mercouri. Simulating a funeral procession, with one member lying on a stretcher, the group entered the room and approached the Minister.


Giannis Gigas argues that the general devaluation of contemporary art was also evident through several facts that took place those years such as the vilification of the well known collector Iolas and the despoliation of his property. See Gigas, Yannis. 2012. ‘Η Κατάληψη του Φωτεινίου’ [Squatting Foteinio] in Arapinis Pantelis, Thoma Sofia, Antonakou Sofia (eds), Αντι-κουλτούρα [Anti-culture] (Sparti, Idiomorfi): 87-95.

The steady members of the group throughout the years (1986-1990) were Stefanos Karababas, Kostas Karoussos, George Tsolis and Kostas Nouvakis. However, the composition of the group was not always the same.
One of the collective’s more interesting actions was realised in 1989, when the group transformed old train coaches, which were offered by the Hellenic Railways Organisation, into mobile educational and exhibition spaces. They organised a series of exhibitions at the train stations of the cities of Alexandroupolis, Drama, Kozani and Thessaloniki in northern Greece. The coaches contained the group’s paintings, along with a twentieth-century art library, and offered wood-engraving lessons to children and a daily interactive slide show on twentieth-century art. The residents of the cities responded positively; many enjoyed the unexpected opportunity to broaden their knowledge of modern and contemporary art. The group distributed a text that explained the aims of their action, in which they wrote the following:

In a reality where individualism is the dominant ideology and practice of human activity, we sensed—understood that art, if it is to have any meaning, must be an essential part of life, a life that must entail the conscious renouncing of the received way of living. At the same time, this is a step intended to sensitise social agents, generally upholding the hope that in Greece also, at some point, artwork will circulate among people,
breaking the shackles of its prison and moving away from the established inaccessible (to the general public) spaces in which it is exhibited and operates, and that, simultaneously, young artists will be given the opportunity to communicate directly with the people.\textsuperscript{324}


In 1989, such an initiative would have been associated with radical pedagogy rather than radical art—the two remained distinct in the public imagination. However, since the 1990s, and especially after 2000, similar practices and projects have become commonplace in the international art scene and are discussed extensively by historians, critics and curators.

\textsuperscript{324} The text was given to the author by Giorgos Nouvakis.
Karatransavanguardia used their name as a critique of the Transavantgarde art movement, which reacted to the explosion of conceptual art by endorsing, in the late 1970s and 1980s, a return to figurative art and defending form over idea and theory.\textsuperscript{325} Strongly associated with postmodernism, Transavantgarde, as imagined by Italian critic Achille Bonito Oliva, encapsulated the conservative tendencies of Western art in a decade that also witnessed the rise of conservative politics in the US, Britain and elsewhere. Karatransavanguardia wished to express the political and social values of its members through encouraging them to live and create together, based on the model of Dadaist groups. Participation in the group would not require artistic or ideological identification but action toward creative critique.\textsuperscript{326} The most important moments in the history of the group were associated with social and political events. Some of its members were among the organisers of the Foteinio squat, which became a space for art experimentation.

Along with students from the School of Fine Art in Athens, the group participated in several actions that oscillated between life and art and art and protest. In 1987, a number of students and some members of the group placed sculptures and easels in the middle of Patision Avenue in Athens, blocking traffic for two days. They also distributed leaflets that described the school’s inadequate conditions to drivers, bus passengers and passers-by. A confrontation with the police was inevitable due to the disruption of the ordinary that this event entailed, but, in this case, it contributed to achieving exposure for the event and led to the problems being encountered by the School being addressed on the headlines of the everyday media.

However, the specific case study makes one consider if the ordinary is necessarily oppressive and what does the temporary disruption of normality achieve in a city with traffic jams and traffic pollution. What does this occupation of public space as disruption offer to the citizens of the city who most probably would feel enraged to come across ‘art objects’ when driving to meet their daily obligations? Such an intervention seems close to Richard Serra’s controversial \textit{Titled Arch} (1981) which was instantly seen as ugly and oppressive, and was finally removed in 1989. As philosopher and art theorist Bojana Kunst has aptly noted in regard to normality and its relation to capitalism,

\textsuperscript{325} Minos Prinarakis, Yannis Gigas and Stelios Georgiou constitute the core of the group that comprised of more than ten members and many collaborators. Some of the members were also members of Katalipsi.

The regularities begin to loosen. This loosening of normality is part of the dynamics of capitalism. It is not simply about liberation. It is about the form of power/authority characteristic of capitalism. This is no longer a disciplinary institutional power/authority that determines every-thing, but power/authority in order to produce diversity—because markets get saturated. Even the weirdest affective tendencies are in order—as long as they bring money.\textsuperscript{327}

The diverse and erratic have become the new imperatives under capitalism leaving no space for normality and regularity. At the same time the limited-time projects also thrive in capitalism where indeed ephemerality achieves nothing but disruption. The relationship between ephemerality, performance art and capitalism will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

In 1990, the group, again with a number of School of Fine Art students, decided to burn their artworks, consisting of paintings and sculptures, at Klaflthmonos Square in central Athens. This was intended as an act of protest against the acquittal of Athanasios Melistas, a policeman who, in 1985, had shot and killed fifteen-year-old Michalis Kaltezas during the demonstrations that took place on the 17\textsuperscript{th} of November. The announcement of Melistas’s acquittal caused violent clashes between anti-authoritarian groups and the police and led to the occupation of the National Technical University premises by members of the left and anarchists. This ‘happening’ was again covered by the press. In 2003, when the US invaded Iraq, the group produced black and white posters of Roberto Matta’s work, \textit{United Snakes of America}, and placed them in the neighbourhoods around their studio in Athens.

Karatransavanguardia used destruction and disruption as potent methods for drawing attention to specific issues or ideas. The concept of destruction has been associated with artistic production since the historical avant gardes. Self-destructive acts that involve physical pain have been performed by several artists, particularly in the field of performance art.\textsuperscript{328} Auto-destructive art, and performance art in general, may sometimes be superficially regarded as constituting an attack on capitalist values and representing resistance to commodification, mainly on the grounds of the immateriality of such works. Yet there is more to consider regarding the association of performance and immateriality (which will be further discussed

\textsuperscript{327} Bojana Kunst. 2015. \textit{Artist at Work: Proximity of Art and Capitalism} (Zero Books), 24-25.
\textsuperscript{328} For example Rauschenberg worked on the idea of ‘destruction’ in relation to another artist’s work with \textit{Erased De Kooning}, pain has also been used as a tool for enlightenment or for breaking the barrier between body and mind by several artists such as Stelarc, Marina Abramovic, Chris Burden.
in Chapter 5) as well as the connection between capitalism and destruction. Destruction is necessary in capitalist processes to produce growth. Economic analysts have seen destruction as intrinsic to capitalism. In Marxian economic theory the concept of ‘creative destruction’ refers broadly to the processes of accumulation and annihilation of wealth under capitalism. Yet the concept has been mainly identified with economist Joseph Schumpeter who derived it from Karl Marx and used it as a theory of economic innovation. According to Schumpeter, the ‘gale of creative destruction’ portrays the ‘process of industrial mutation that incessantly revolutionises the economic structure from within, incessantly destroying the old one, incessantly creating a new one’.  

David Harvey has also explained the ways creative destruction is embedded within the circulation of capital itself, noting that the effect of continuous innovation is ‘to devalue, if not destroy, past investments and labour skills’. New product lines are constantly opened up leading to the creation of new needs. Innovation therefore ‘exacerbates instability, insecurity, and in the end, becomes the prime force pushing capitalism into periodic paroxysms of crisis’. It is doubtful therefore whether destruction can be considered as a revolutionary tool against capitalist values.

Both groups, Katalispsi and Karatransavaguardia, consisted of anarchists and left-wing students who wanted not only to claim better conditions for the development of contemporary art in a country that had always given priority to, and was identified with, the art of antiquity, but also to critique art institutions and their mechanisms. They were not interested in presenting their works within art institutions; rather, they intended to situate their art in public spaces so as to engage and interact with a broader audience, not solely museum goers. This critique of art institutions, combined with a conscious refusal to operate in their context, was unusual in Greece, where, as previously discussed in Chapter 1, the dearth of institutional infrastructure and support made many generally sympathetic to the art institution yet also critical towards it.


331 Ibid., 106. See also David Harvey. 2006. ‘Neo-liberalism as Creative Destruction’, *Geografiska Annaler*, 88/2: 145-158.
4.1 *Urban Void: Reclaiming the Voids of the City*

During the late 1990s, the ‘beautification’ of Athens became an imperative need as a result of the impending Olympic Games, which were scheduled for 2004. The process of gentrification had already begun in specific areas, such as the district of Psiri in the city centre, in the late 1980s. The supposed importance of regenerating key districts of the capital was intensified due to the Olympic Games, and formerly deteriorated urban neighbourhoods were transformed into entertainment areas that were packed with cafes, bars, night clubs and restaurants.\(^{332}\) The process of gentrification usually engenders conflicts concerning financial investments, political motives and social beneficiaries.\(^{333}\) Greece was no exception, despite the fact that the intense politicisation of the 1970s and 1980s was receding, as it had been largely overtaken by political apathy in the 1990s and there was much anticipation for the great development projects that would complete the process of the country’s ‘modernisation’. The booming construction industry of those years prompted concerns regarding the use, transformation and exploitation of public space, especially within the urban fabric. The Urban Void [Astiko Keno] collective was founded with this in mind.

Urban Void was comprised of architects and artists but remained open to collaborations with other professionals and the public.\(^{334}\) The group was mainly active between 1998 and 2006 and produced thirteen actions in public places. Unused areas in the district of Psiri, the unexploited spaces of roofs, Klafthmonos Square, refugee housing, and other neglected or under-transformation spaces and places ‘characterised by ambiguity in respect to their identity, use or legal status’ became the domains in which they conducted their practices.\(^ {335}\) Some of the actions invited the active participation of the public, while others were more furtive. The events organised by the collective included, for example, walking and carrying empty buckets on the bed of the river Kifissos. Kifissos, Athens’ largest river, flows through the city, eventually reaching the Saronic Gulf. Unfortunately, nowadays, it has become a flowing garbage dump and a repository for toxic industrial waste, while, for its final 15 km, it has been channelled under a highway flyover. Other events included wandering on terraces,


\(^{333}\) It is well known that gentrification is a process during which wealthy individuals buy and renovate houses and stores in deteriorated urban neighbourhoods. Gentrification raises property values and therefore displaces low income residents and small businesses. The term is therefore controversial

\(^{334}\) The group consisted of Fivi Giannisi, Jimmy Eythimiou, Lia Kanagini, Nikos Kazero, Zisi Kotioni, Panos Kouros, Zofos Xagoraris, Christina Parakente, Eleni Tzirtzilaki, Hariklia Hari.

having lunch at the Plato’s Academy archaeological site, playing games in the refugee housing at Alexandra Avenue (the Refugee Houses, one of the earliest examples of the modern movement in Greece, were built between 1933 and 1935 as part of a 1930s programme intended to provide housing in Athens for refugees from Asia Minor) and provoking public discussions with Underground passengers.\textsuperscript{336} According to the group, their objective was ‘to bring into discussion the social and political dimension of the parasitical, seemingly vacant urban sites’.\textsuperscript{337} Yet, although their activity is mostly defined by architectural pursuits and scrutinising urban planning, in some cases, the issues raised exceed concerns with urban space per se and its problematics. I chose to discuss three of the collective’s actions, each of which entails different characteristics and demonstrates a range of interactions with space and the public.

In 1998, the group organised the collective action \textit{Speeches at an Open Site-Psyri} in Psyri. They installed a row of microphones between two buildings at a floodlit open-air site and invited citizens, guests and passers-by to participate in the action. The event was publicised by means of posters put up in the city centre that announced the collective’s political message concerning the protection and re-activation of the capital’s urban voids. The team invited citizens to use the podium and the microphones to present their own views and ideas, freely and simultaneously, for an hour. Initially delivered by members of the group, the simultaneous presentations included poetry readings, the reciting of cooking recipes and the reading of manifestos and ‘significant texts’, along with prayers, pleas and insults. As the group notes, the simultaneity of the action ‘generated tension as well as fun, bringing about conflicting comments, embarrassment or even silence’.\textsuperscript{338}

\textsuperscript{336} For a detailed description of their actions see Urban Void. 2007. \textit{Actions 1998-2006}.


\textsuperscript{338} Urban Void. 2007, 30.
Simultaneous speaking (and the accompanying risk of cacophony and incoherence) has been a standard feature in the group’s public activities. It was repeated, in a different way, in an action performed at the port of Patras that focused on political refugees. On the 15th of June 2000, the group performed *Travel-Immigration* on Patra’s waterfront. The port of Patras, with its many boats that sail to Italy, has been one of the gateways into Europe for refugees and immigrants for many years. Thousands have risked, and many times lost, their lives in attempting to cross the border. Urban Void realised their performance at the waterfront, on the old and abandoned premises of the Saint Georgios Mill, opposite the international pier and next to a permanent, yet clandestine and illegal, Kurdish refugee settlement. Each member took up a position by a different window on the multi-storey building. Each read his or her text aloud, under the red light of a gas lamp. They read both simultaneously and in turn. The texts, spoken through megaphones in order to carry their voices to the settlement and the port, included excerpts from tourist guides to Patras and Italy, shipping timetables, holiday ads, press references to fatal immigrant accidents, Old Testament references to the persecution of people and personal accounts relating to the topic of the action. The order and duration of the action were set in advance. In this specific performance, the random members of the public were more observers than participants, as the action was performed solely by the group members.

A year before, in 1999, when hundreds of Kurds congregated and made their homes under deplorable conditions at Koumoundourou Square in Athens, Urban Void performed the action *The City Upside-Down* at the nearby Klaftomonos Square. The members of the group sat or lay down on the pavement of Stadiou Street, one of the city’s most central avenues, which connects the Syntagma and Omonoia squares. A leaflet that invited citizens to participate and discuss the plight of the homeless Kurds in Greece was distributed in the surrounding areas. The occupation of a sidewalk crammed with shoppers, office workers and tourists in a manner that disrupted ‘normality’ and the flow of everyday life once again invited a response from the police. In their account of the action, the collective mentions that the police decided to tolerate the small gathering so as not to attract the attention of passers-by, as they were ‘reluctant to deal with the unforeseeable consequences that a potential magnification of the event could have’. Such a repossession of public space can be considered as both suggestive of a different perspective on the city and a reference to the homeless refugees. Seeing the sky from such a position insinuates identification with the homeless economic immigrants. The fact that the action took place at the same square where PASOK had erected its prefab pavilions for their election campaign may also reflect an element of irony. The action, per se, namely an unusual gesture made in a public space, bears some resemblance to the actions performed by so-called flash mobs, which are discussed next.

340 Ibid., 66.
In her review of a volume of essays and documents on Urban Void’s actions and essays, artist Anna Tsouloufi-Lagiou considers what is achieved ‘pragmatically’ through the group’s fusion of avant-garde tactics and activism. She questions the effectiveness of such artistic practices and notes a narcissistic or introverted tendency within the group that prevented the further evolution of their created situations to the point where they might appear socially productive and useful. Tsouloufi-Lagiou identifies ‘effectiveness’ as the criterion for assessing Urban Void’s actions; yet, in what ways can a work of art—or, in fact, any other intellectual product—be considered as being effective? Would it ever be possible for an art practice to intervene in the process of gentrification and prevent its realisation or to influence the government’s immigration policies when even the death of so many people throughout the years has not resulted in political changes? Evaluating an art work or project on the grounds of its social effectiveness will likely lead to the rejection of all art practices, with the exception of those community-based projects that can provide evidence of their contributions to the welfare of specific communities and/or minorities. One should keep in mind, however, that, while such community art projects may offer ephemeral relief and aid to people in need, they may also contribute to the ineffectiveness of social services since they are, in fact, replacing them.

4.3 Intervention through Subversion of Place: The Case of Flash Mobs

A new type of alternative utilisation and animation of place has also been prompted by the Sfina collective. Sfina, which is based in Thessaloniki, is an alternative expression of the concept of a flash mob. According to the 11th edition of the Oxford Concise English Dictionary, published in July 2004, a flash mob is ‘a public gathering of complete strangers, organised via the Internet or mobile phone, who perform a pointless act and then disperse again.’ The intention behind such a public performance, as conceived by Billy Wasik, the New York journalist who introduced the concept of the flash mob in 2003, is to generate unexpected situations in urban environments. The act of participating in an exciting and

342 The word ‘sfina’ in Greek refers to something that is interjected in a process and prevents its continuous and smooth evolution.
fleeting event, which is devoid of any ideological background, is the main focus of such an action.\textsuperscript{344}

Insisting on the absence of any ideological purpose or background, Wasik notes that the concept of a flash mob was ‘planned by no one, born not of a will to metaspectacle but of basic human need.’\textsuperscript{345} However, the socio-political framework of New York in 2003 struggled to coherently lend itself to ideas devoid of ideology that were aimed only at having fun. After the September 11th attacks of 2001, people needed a way to overcome their uneasiness and fear of public gatherings and perhaps to respond to the restrictions on personal freedom imposed by continuous street-level surveillance. Wasik had conceived the flash mob as being specifically a New York concept, as people there are always searching for the next big thing:

\begin{quote}
...given all culture in New York was demonstrably commingled with scenesterism, my thinking ran, it should be theoretically possible to create an art project consisting of a pure scene—meaning the scene would be the entire point of the work, and indeed would itself constitute the work.\textsuperscript{346}
\end{quote}

He liked the idea of being frank about the pure scenesterism deployed by flash mobs: ‘But the idea was that the people themselves would become the show, and that just by responding to this random email, they would, in a sense, create something.’\textsuperscript{347} Yet, his intentions here might seem slightly confusing, since he seems to identify this pure scenesterism as an art project. It is also questionable if there is truly no ideology present when one simply declares its absence.

The first Greek flash mob took place in Athens in 2003, in total accordance with Wasik’s principles and practice in New York. In 2008, however, another group of people, in Thessaloniki this time, transformed the concept of a flash mob into something markedly removed from the principles that gave rise to this practice. Sfina, as described on its website, is ‘an interventionist group whose focus is the creation of surreal situations in the city, aiming at the interruption of urban environment’s routine and the satisfaction of thinking up a great idea and then bringing it to life’.\textsuperscript{348}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{344} Wasik Bill. 2009. \textit{And Then There Is This} (Viking Press).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{345} Ibid., 40.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{346} Ibid., 23.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{348} Sfina, \url{http://vimeo.com/sfina} [accessed 20/10/2010].
\end{flushright}
In the first case, it is clear that those involved, at least during the emergence of this practice, were primarily interested in the substance of the temporary event, the action that takes place during those specifically designated minutes. With regard to the preparation process, the announcement of the event would always occur through ‘viral’ means, while final instructions would be given just a few minutes before the event took place. However, after some time, flash-mobbers—both organisers and participants—started filming both themselves and the reactions of surprised passers-by during the performances. The videos were later uploaded online and are watched by thousands, and sometimes millions, of people. The few minutes of action are thus preserved in history and available on monitors for years.

In the case of Sfina, the interest seems to have been focused equally on both the event and the documentation thereof, which alters, in a sense, the essence of the flash mob concept. People meet in advance of the set time of the action, communicate with each other and carry equipment in order to document the event. The resulting videos are edited, montaged and enhanced with music and explanatory text where necessary. Footage of preparations and the aftermath of actions are also posted online. The resulting videos are made available online, to be watched by anyone interested. Depending on one’s interpretation, photographs and videos either function as substitutes for, or complete, the real event, diversifying the focus so that it rests on both representation and presence, while simultaneously encapsulating a (re)turn to the document widely observed within the contemporary art world. As Boris Groys remarks, documentation ‘inscribes the existence of an object in history, gives a lifespan to this existence, and gives the object life as such—indeed, whether this object was “originally” living or artificial.’ A second consequence that stems from the diffusion of the documentation of flash-mob performances is the destabilisation of the notion of audience. This destabilisation also occurs in the case of performance art or participatory projects that are later exhibited through representational documentation. Yet the limitations of an exhibition, in terms of the number of viewers it can accommodate, disappear, as flash mob actions posted on YouTube can be watched by millions simultaneously. The uses of the document in relation to performative practices are further analysed in Chapter 5.

350 John H. Muse proceeds to a further distinction of audiences ‘from the strangers they surprise to the authorities they flout, the mainstream media they entertain, the online followers they impress, and the participants themselves, who gather to watch themselves take part’. John H. Muse. 2010. ‘Flash Mobs and the Diffusion of Audience’, Theatre, 40/3, 10-11.
Although none of the group’s documents have been used as an exhibit thus far, Sfina has performed live within the framework of art, which suggests that Sfina has diverged not only from the notion of a politically disinterested execution of a prescribed situation but also from the original concept of a flash mob. Sfina’s inclusion in the second Biennale of Thessaloniki in 2009 means that artistic intentions can be attributed to this group.

Exploring the content and context of flash-mob events entails considering a possible sociopolitical dimension associated with the specific selections of place and action. Central and public places, shopping centres, train stations, buses and the Underground are chosen for actions unrelated to the distinctiveness of these specific venues. Instead of consuming, flash mobbers merely ‘wake up’ in a shopping centre; instead of being transported, they drink and dance on a bus, indifferent to its route; instead of viewing the artworks of the biennale in Thessaloniki, they wander around with their eyes covered; instead of walking, they stand silent and motionless.

People blog, create profiles on Internet communities, write and record so that they can be read, heard and seen by others. They need to be part of something, to fulfil their need for a sense of belonging, and so they gather; they return to physicality and collective endeavour. Is the phenomenon of flash mob an instance of what Gustave Le Bon called ‘the mind of crowds’? Does it represent a microcosm of the general consensus and diffused subjection that characterises contemporary society, or is it a reaction against that consensus?

Interestingly, an engagement with aesthetic values can be identified in several recent protest actions in Greece. As mentioned previously, the murder of a young student by police on the 6th of December 2008 resulted in demonstrations and rioting across Greece, with thousands of people taking over the streets of Athens and Thessaloniki. Solidarity demonstrations were also organised in other European cities. Protesters in central Athens battled riot police by smashing the windows of banks, supermarket chains and car dealerships with petrol bombs and Molotov cocktails. The official media, both in Athens and around the world, along with theorists, politicians, academics and journalists, has extensively discussed, and analysed from diverse viewpoints, the possible reasons for the scale of these riots, which erupted overnight, carried on for days and were supported by the majority of Greek population. Public spaces

were turned into battlefields and, at the same time, platforms for performative aestheticised protests. One of the symbolic actions that took place during the riots occurred in front of the police headquarters in Athens, when a group of teenagers removed their clothes and lay down on the stairs half-naked, obviously alluding to the violent death of young Grigoropoulos. Drawing on the tradition of performance art, such participatory action bears a resemblance not only to the events realised by Sfina but also to the work of the artist Spencer Tunick, who has used flash mobs to produce installations and photographic works that feature hundreds of naked bodies in public spaces. The use of performance by protesters and artists was animated by the shared intention to publicly contrast the vulnerability and fragility of the human body with the structural brutality of social control in the modern city.

Following the murder of Grigoropoulos on the 6th of December 2008, the rioting youth proceeded to torch the publicly installed Christmas tree at Syntagma Square two nights later. The tree, which was burned down by rioters, was later replaced; the new tree was guarded by police forces, but it was eventually attacked with plastic bags full of rubbish. In 2008, the image of a gigantic, glowing Christmas tree being guarded by police officers, while many surrounding buildings had been devastated in the course of the riots, seemed, besides being ridiculous, quite representative of the country’s situation. One other significant gesture of protest was the interruption of theatrical performances in public institutions, specifically theatres such as the National Theatre and the State Orchestra, which are largely funded by the state. Rioters would burst into these venues, calling for audience solidarity, while the Opera House was occupied for two full weeks. Interventionist action and the sabotage of cultural activities within public institutions were tactics of civil disobedience associated with the avant-garde, including Surrealism and Situationism. Yet it is unlikely that the Greek rioters of 2008 were consciously drawing on the European avant-garde. According to Greek art theorist Kostis Stafylakis, some of the above forms of protest derive from a narcissistic need to assure visibility, which could also account for the emergence of flash mobs and their vast appeal.

---
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Conclusions

The deployment of art ‘in public’, ‘for the public’ or ‘by the public’ and the enhancement of communications between artist, audience and artwork has been an important concern in contemporary Greek art since the 1970s. According to Deutsche, the term ‘public’ has some democratic connotations, implying ‘openness’, ‘accessibility’, ‘participation’, ‘inclusion’ and ‘accountability’ to ‘the people.’ Consequently, any discourse that focuses on public or public-oriented art is ‘not only a site of deployment of the term public space but, more broadly, of the term democracy,’ and specifically of its misinterpretation and its misuses.355

The French curator Nicolas Bourriaud has declared that ‘the aura of artworks has shifted towards their public’ and set the focus on art that, in its processes, encompasses the creation of micro-communities.356 In Bourriaud’s analysis, the implication is that the public in relational art is no longer a passive and lethargic audience but has instead been transformed into an animated participant; it therefore becomes a co-producer that adds value to the artwork. However, according to the philosopher Jacques Rancière, activity is present in both viewing and acting, spectator and actor. When Rancière discusses the potential of an ‘emancipated spectator’, he does not intend to transform spectators into participants through a corporeal experience but to clarify the specificity of knowledge and the activity already at work in the spectator. The viewers are also active when they observe, compare or interpret a work according to their own lived experiences; therefore, they can be both distant spectators and active interpreters of the spectacle offered to them.357 Physically participation cannot therefore guarantee either the artwork’s impact on the viewer or the viewer’s genuine engagement with the artwork. As discussed in Chapter 1, the audiences of the performances of the 1970s were intensely engaged with the artworks ‘conceptually’, through an intellectual participation and not necessarily a corporeal/active one. As critic Claire Bishop has pointed out in her critique of Bourriaud’s relational aesthetics, participatory projects that are connected to ‘relational’ practices or public art neither guarantee the transformation of the public into an active agent nor do they necessarily convey a democratic ideal: ‘The mere fact of being collaborative, or participatory, or interactive, is not enough to legitimise a work or

guarantee its significance’. Bishop’s argument is corroborated by the fact that participation is often used today by creative industries, the mass media, cultural tourism and governments as a means of controlling the public. It is more important to examine how an artwork addresses and intervenes in the dominant conventions and relations of its time.

As mentioned in the introduction, the aim of this chapter has been to present the conditions of performative art production in Greek public space and examine the diversity of performative interventions in this context. The concept of participation has been treated differently in each chapter section, according to the varied forms of interaction that each project allowed for and/or requested. As it has been shown, the connection or disconnection between publics, artists and artworks not only remains unpredictable in the case of public art but also this unpredictability may well constitute a key attribute of performance art.

The chapter examined the potentiality of performance art to intervene in public space but also its impossibility to do so under certain conditions. Although censorship mechanisms (as in the case of Sagri’s Polytechnieio) and confrontation with the authorities (as in the case of Basdekis’s Tama Art) may seem to suppress speech and obstruct public communication, in effect they do not work against the artists and artworks but for them. What I mean is that such conditions reinforce the artwork’s function as both an intervention and a confrontation. On the contrary, in cases where the state apparatus (the police) acted cleverly and democratically by letting the artists perform, when they could have removed them (as in the case with Urban Void), the artwork loses its power/impact. This case shows that acceptance, liberalism and ‘democracy’ are not always art’s best friends. It shows that to make your cause public as an artist you may well need the confrontation and when this confrontation is denied, the artwork fails; its political mission fails. Indeed, the aim of this chapter has been to discuss both failure and success and to provide some belated and partial at least visibility to the socio-political causes of these works.

Chantal Mouffe in ‘Artistic Activism and Agonistic Space’ suggests that the objective of counter-hegemonic artistic interventions is ‘to occupy the public space in order to disrupt the smooth image that corporate capitalism is trying to spread, bringing to the fore its repressive character’, which is exactly what some of the performative interventions of the chapter
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achieved through confrontation.\textsuperscript{359} To acknowledge the political dimension of such interventions assumes to abandon the idea that to be political requires ‘making a total break with existing state of affairs in order to create something absolutely new’.\textsuperscript{360} Mouffe maintains that artists today can have a political role in the hegemonic struggle ‘by subverting the dominant hegemony and by contributing to the construction of new subjectivities’.\textsuperscript{361} Yet, as mentioned also in the previous chapter, this does not mean that art by itself could lead to the establishment of a new hegemony; a radical democratic politics along with diverse levels of political struggles would be necessary towards such a direction.\textsuperscript{362}

The concept of performance as an intervention that disrupts the normality of the status quo and the dominant logic of public space can find its encapsulation in the concept of the ‘event’ as discussed by Alain Badiou. According to Badiou, ‘normality—which balances presentation (belonging) and representation (inclusion), and which symmetrises structure (what is presented in presentation) and metastructure (what is counted as one by the state of the situation)—provides a pertinent concept of equilibrium, of stability, and of remaining-there-in-itself.’\textsuperscript{363} The ‘event’, according to Badiou, disrupts normality and challenges the dominant ideology in a similar way that artistic intervention also intends to do. An event happens when the excluded part appears on the social scene and ruptures the appearance of normality. While the excluded part remains invisible under the dominant ideology, when an event happens, it is exposed. An event is therefore something similar to a rupture of the social order and can be transformative for the participants.\textsuperscript{364}

\textsuperscript{359} Chantal Mouffe. 2007. ‘Artistic Activism and Agonistic Spaces’, \textit{Art and Research: A Journal of Ideas, Contexts and Methods}, 1/2, 5.

\textsuperscript{360} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{361} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{362} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{363} Alain Badiou [Translated by Alberto Toscano]. 2009. \textit{Logics of Worlds: Being and Event II} (Continuum), 127.

\textsuperscript{364} See Badiou, 2009.
Chapter 3

The Politics of Gender and the Performative Body

Introduction

This chapter explores the ambiguous relationship between performance art and the feminist movement in Greece by examining case studies ranging from the 1970s to the 2010s. Performance art in Western Europe and the US proved an ideal match for the feminist discourse of the late 1960s and 1970s, during which time feminist artists explored autobiography, the female body and politics. Feminism played a crucial role in developing and expanding the paradigm of performance. Although the feminist movement had a strong presence in Greece during the late 1970s and 1980s, only a limited number of artists situated their work within feminist politics. Thus, a significant weakness was, and remains, the absence of a feminist theoretical approach in the work of many women artists. Even when works of art (in this case, performances) addressed gender politics, whether intentionally or not, art historians have, in most cases, refrained from situating them within a feminist framework, thus depriving these works of a feminist reading. One of the limited number of comprehensive studies on Greek female artists and the links their work draws to feminism was conducted by art historians and theorists Elpida Karaba, Polyna Kosmadaki, Sotiris Bahtetzis and Kostis Stafylakis in 2007; this study was conducted and published (however, it is only available online) in the context of the Athens School of Fine Arts' post-doctoral research program.

It is well known that, by the early 1970s, feminism had generated a recognised art movement in both Western Europe and the US. Feminists organised women-only exhibitions and formed groups dedicated to activism, research and consciousness-raising. Private everyday actions, personal stories and objects became the subject matter of women’s art, while, very often, the
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366 The research can be found at http://www.asfa.gr/greek/activities/site_skaltsas/pages/periexomena.html [accessed 15/4/2017].
artists’ own bodies became the artistic medium itself. Feminist performance artists reclaimed their bodies from the male-dominated art world through the use of performance art, a medium which allowed them to become active agents (as opposed to objects of the male gaze) and to explore issues related to the social construction of gender and the roles such construction dictated. As mentioned previously, while some Greek female artists have been exploring gender roles and attitudes since the 1970s through performance art, the absence of a feminist theoretical approach has deprived their work of a thorough feminist analysis. Even in the case of Leda Papaconstantinou, the most eminent feminist artist (at least with regard to performance art), art historians have avoided conducting in-depth theoretical analyses of her work from a feminist perspective, despite the fact that they acknowledge her as a feminist artist. In most cases, references to her name, which are numerous, remain descriptive of her work. It should be noted that assuming a social identity as a feminist artist in Greece (from the 1970s up to today) implies that one has chosen to work against the dominant codes of the art establishment (with few exceptions), without the option of relying on an alternative support network of feminist critics and historians.\textsuperscript{367}

Chapter 3 is divided into four sections, each of which examines different themes relating to gender politics, addressed by artists of various generations. The first section investigates subjects rarely addressed by Greek artists, namely the pregnant body and women’s reproductive role. The second section addresses the politics of beauty, discussing the two different approaches adopted in the contrasting work of Leda Paconstantinou and Niki Kanagini. The chapter then moves on to examine the significant subject of domestic labour. Again, two different approaches are explored, denoting that performance art is not always solely a medium for transmitting radical subversive messages but can also become a carrier of conservative ideas.

1. Pregnant Bodies and Social Reproduction

Leda Papaconstantinou, as mentioned previously, is the most prominent Greek performance artist. She was among the few artists who, at least for a certain period, consciously worked as feminist and whose work has also been identified as such by a number of Greek art historians.

\textsuperscript{367} An important research on Greek women artists has also been conducted by Angela Dimitrakaki during her PhD studies. However, the research is exclusively concerned with painting and has not be published. See Angela Dimitrakaki. 2000. \textit{Gender, Geographies, Representation: Women, Painting and the Body in Britain and Greece, 1970-1990}, Unpublished PhD Thesis (University of Reading).
Papaconstantinou lived and studied in London during the years of the dictatorship and moved in feminist circles, which influenced her work. Yet, despite her partial recognition as feminist artist, very few of her works have been properly analysed within a feminist (or other) theoretical framework, and, overall, one could say that her work has not been subjected to in-depth theoretical analysis.  

In 1970, in her *Pregnant* performance, Papaconstantinou, whose work explores stereotypical attitudes to gender roles, sexual behaviours and beliefs, focused on subjects rarely addressed by Greek women artists: the pregnant body and, consequently, women’s sexual and reproductive rights and freedoms. The struggle for sexual and reproductive rights has been the keystone of feminist activism and struggle for many decades. Second-wave feminism saw women’s organisations battling for (among other important issues in regard to political and social equality) access to safe contraceptives, the right to abortion, greater awareness of domestic violence, better policies and laws intended to address rape, and the eradication of the practice of female genital mutilation. Yet, half a century later, women around the world still fight for the same rights.

Papaconstantinou’s performance took place at Maidstone College of Art in the UK, during her studies. An account of the performance, provided by the artist herself, can be found in the publication *Performance, Film, Video, 1969-2004*, a comprehensive catalogue of her performances, films and videos:

> In the centre of a dimly lit stage, a very pregnant woman is sitting on a chair. She is dressed in layers of tattered fine polythene. Behind her, seven men crouch, hidden, under a long grey fabric. On a screen above her head runs a super-8 film, exploring the body of a real pregnant lady. The portraits of an old man and an old woman are projected on either side of the film. As a Greek lullaby is heard, six pregnant women carrying candles move through the audience on to the stage; we stand around the sitting
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368 Although her work has been mentioned in many Greek publications about contemporary art, in most cases the references are more descriptive rather than analytical.


165
figure in a semi-circle. The men slowly begin to rise, forming a tall human wall that moves forward imperceptibly. Their movement and the deep sound they produce are threatening. I begin to operate on the swollen belly of the central figure; liquids and flesh-like stuff spills onto the floor as my scissors cut deeply. From under the cloth, appear the huge uniformly grey shapes of the male figures. With swift, precise incisions, I separate the belly from its hostess and hand it over to the women, who carry it through the audience. The dripping umbilical cord is still attached to its owner. I sever the cord and all women exit, pursued by the men, who climb over the spectators, dragging behind them the heavy grey cloth. Blue floodlight on stage, smoke and the empty husk of a woman sitting on her chair. Lullaby is heard again, fading softly. 370

Figure 3.1: Leda Papaconstantinou, Pregnant, 1970, Performance, Maidstone College of Art, Kent.

According to the artist, the stimulus for the conceptualisation and realisation of this performance was her observation of important differences between the appearances of pregnant women (and their reception by others) in Greece and other Western European countries during the 1960s. As she explains, she first observed the way in which pregnant women used to dress in Greece during their pregnancies: They tended to cover their bodies under loose-fitting clothes, as if they were trying to hide their abdomens. On the contrary, as the artist observed, in Western countries, pregnancy would not stop women from dressing as they used to previously.\textsuperscript{371}

The apparent intention of women to ‘conceal’ their pregnancies cannot but be related to a number of issues, as I intend to discuss. The artist’s observation of pregnant women’s stances toward their own bodies is inescapably related to the reception of their bodies by others, as women are constantly defined by their appearances. The intense conservatism of Greece is also indicative of the religious conservatism that plagued (and, to some extent, still plagues) Greek society, underscoring religion’s constitutive contribution not only to the construction and domination of patriarchal ideology and practice but also to women’s submission and consensus to such ideology. The traditions, values and behaviours dictated by Christianity have always imposed a problematic, and very often contradictory, relationship between the self and the body, particularly for women. For instance, while traditional norms emphasised women’s obligation—not right—to become mothers, at the same time, until a few decades ago, it seemed that women were expected to be ashamed of their sexuality and to even ‘conceal’ their pregnancies as indicative of their sexual activities. A pregnant woman would be perceived as incorporating not only the divine—in relation to Mother Nature—but also the disgraceful and grotesque.

Greek national identity has historically been strongly tied to the Greek Orthodox Church. Religion has been a determining factor in the construction and formation of Greek society since the establishment of the autonomous Greek state (1830), as it constituted one of the three social institutions (with family and the nation being the other two) used by the Greek state and the ruling class to control and oppress the nation’s citizens. Traditional gender roles were, and to some extent continue, to be (at least partly) prescribed by the Orthodox Church.\textsuperscript{372} The putative ‘passive’ and certainly unacknowledged role played by women in the family and society was reinforced by religion, which had great impact on women. According

\textsuperscript{371} Leda Papaconstantinou, interview with the author, (10/1/2010).

to the Church (and, therefore, the state as well), men and women have specific gender roles, different duties and roles, in accordance with their nature. Women should therefore live under the control of men, who are considered naturally superior and the leaders of families. These roles are exclusive, and under no circumstances would one be allowed to perform the role of the other. Thus, any kind of feminist values are considered abhorrent by the Church.\textsuperscript{373}

The Church is identified with both the Greek identity and nation because of the important role it had played in national liberation. The rules of the Church therefore had great influence on the newly founded state, and religion became a carrier of state ideology and culture, while its practices and premises became national matters, as opposed to personal concerns. Women’s obligation to demonstrate moral virtue and modesty were considered constituents of national unity and were accepted by all social classes. Thus, the expectations imposed on women in terms of sexuality, role and image by the Church united all Greeks, irrespective of class differences. The austere and extremely conservative stance of the Church was not in any way challenged or subverted by the state, a fact that indicates that male hegemony utterly controlled and permeated all social institutions. Women, on the other hand, accepted the rules of the Church and were influenced by its imperatives.\textsuperscript{374}

To return to the pregnant body, in \textit{Bodies: Exploring Fluid Boundaries}, Robyn Longhurst uses case studies to examine the intersections of material bodies, public spaces and dominant cultural narratives. By studying the relationships between bodies, places and power, Longhurst argues that the ignoring of the materiality of bodies that ‘leak’ and ‘seep’ holds a political imperative that reinforces the hegemonic masculinist discourses.\textsuperscript{375} Pregnant women used to experience a sense of confinement, and, at some level, they may still do so, since many of them withdraw from public space as they become more visibly pregnant. This behaviour is related to the reception of the pregnant, and therefore deviant body, which can be thought of, both by pregnant women themselves and by others, as ugly; this is relevant to Kristeva’s concept of the abject.\textsuperscript{376} Julian Kristeva, in her seminal essay \textit{Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection}, describes the abject as the grotesque, the repulsive, that which we want to expel and dispose of. Through a series of descriptive accounts of abject encounters, Kristeva suggests that abject experiences are common in everyday life; one might experience an abject response when encountering bodily waste, such as secretions, excretions, vomit and

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{373} Ibid., 164-167.
\textsuperscript{374} Ibid., 165-167.
\textsuperscript{376} Ibid. 33.
\end{flushleft}
menstrual discharge. Kristeva theorises that abjection associates the abject with all that is revolting and intriguing about bodies and, in particular, those aspects of bodily experience that undermine singular bodily integrity and cause a loss of the distinction between subject and object or between self and other: fluids, orifices, sex, defecation, vomiting, death, decay, menstruation, pregnancy and childbirth. Indeed, Kristeva discusses experiences of abjection in terms of bodily affect, moments of physical disgust that result in ‘a discharge, a convulsion, a crying out’. The significance of these abject moments and the reason that they provoke revulsion and fear is, according to Kristeva, not due to their lack of cleanliness or the implications that they have for health ‘but what disturbs identity, system, order’: ‘What does not respect borders, positions, rules. The in-between, the ambiguous, the composite’.

Kristeva’s notion of the abject as something that interferes with order and system, and disrupts identity can be used to explain, at least to some extent, not only the pregnant body’s isolation but also its relation to aggression and violence. The violent cutting of the performer’s belly during the performance may be read as a reference to the connection between pregnancy, the abject and domestic violence. While pre-existing violence within an intimate relationship is a strong predictor of battery during pregnancy, Michele Decker, Sandra Martin, and Kathryn Moracco argue that pregnancy functions to trigger new instances of violence. Indeed, their research suggests that 30% of women experience their first physical assault by a male partner when they become pregnant for the first time, and that, when intimate partner violence already exists in a relationship, the ferocity of the violence intensifies. As they state, ‘partner violence that occurs during pregnancy may be a marker of increased risk of severe and potentially lethal danger for some women’. Physical assaults that begin or escalate during pregnancy often have a different pattern of violence, with pregnant women being more likely to suffer multiple sites of bodily injury. Maria de Bruyn supports this analysis, noting that ‘instead of receiving strikes against the head, [pregnant women] suffer beatings directed towards the abdomen and chest’, and, according to a North
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American study she cites, ‘pregnant women were hit in the abdomen twice as often as non-pregnant women’.382

On the other hand, in recent years, the pregnant body seems to have become something of ‘fashion statement’. Celebrity mums are promoting the concept of ‘pregnancy chic’ while a whole new market has been growing around new forms of maternity clothing for women to remain chic. It is now regarded as not only acceptable, but desirable for many celebrities to display their pregnant bodies across the mass media creating new kinds of pressure to expectant mothers to live up to certain ideals of appearance and body shape.383 
Papaconstantinou’s performance raises a number of issues that have been ignored by Greek art historians. As Dimitrakaki has argued, ‘One of the reasons that the preoccupation with the body as a gendered space was not the subject of art historical discourse was because the human form was always seen as the sign of a certain continuity over decades and, for many, centuries of Greek art’. 384

The pregnant body has been negotiated in a different manner by artist Foteini Kalle in her performance Reproduction, which was presented at the Bageion Hotel, Omonoia, Athens, during the Athens Biennale of 2015. A video projected during the performance showed a child building a wooden tower; meanwhile, the artist placed pieces of carbon on a table. She took her clothes off, covered her eyes with a piece of tile and started breaking the pieces of carbon with a hammer. While the child built, the artist destroyed. Kalle then used the dust from the carbon to cover her face and body. According to the artist, the juxtaposition of the two ‘events’, creation and the destruction, underlined the contradiction between reproduction, a natural process that encompasses life, and social reproduction, which involves death: ‘the death of ideas, thinking and existence’. 385

384 Dimitrakaki, 2000, 42.
385 Communication with the artist (16/1/2017).
The idea that reproduction is not about creating life but instead the creation of new workers has preoccupied a new wave of feminist theorists and activists (who often draw on the theories of the 1970s) who wish to explore women’s place in production and pose questions regarding social reproduction. The recent strikes (2016-2017) of women in many countries ‘became a consciousness-raising exercise in the public visibility of the gender division of labour’.

The reproductive role of women encompasses the care and maintenance of the existing and future workforce of the family (including childbearing responsibilities and domestic labour). The community-managing role of women therefore involves unpaid labour that is mainly related to care. Women’s reproductive labour has no recognisable exchange value; therefore, it cannot be shown, in patriarchal terms, that the male economy depends on it. This long-lasting relationship between patriarchy and capitalism has led to care and reproduction being thought of as universal in the feminine nature, while, in effect, it is a
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See the event ‘Women’s Work in Revolt: Feminist Struggle and Insurrectionary Memory’ (30/6/2017), [accessed 15/6/2017].
social construct that arises from patriarchal law entwined with capitalist modes of production.³⁸⁷

2. The Politics of Beauty

*The Box* was a work created and performed by Papaconstantinou and her collaborate Lesley Walton (alias Sally Smith) twice in 1981. It was first realised in Gallery 3 in Athens and then in the exhibition Περιβάλλον-Δράση - Τάσεις της Σύγχρονης Ελληνικής Τέχνης (Action and Space – Trends of Contemporary Greek Art) in Zappeion, Athens. The work consisted of an installation and a series of durational performances that took place every day for a week. The main installation was comprised of a large white wooden box (150 x 100 x 150 cm) divided into three sections: a black room, a white room and, between the two, a red one. A huge wooden crown, adorned with rusty old fixtures instead of electric bulbs, was hung on the wall behind the box as a relic of the monarchical era. On both sides of the crown, the artists displayed old documents related to female labour, such as time sheets, disciplinary letters, etc., along with several photographs of a woman standing in the ruins of the old textile mill on the island of Spetses, embroidering a kerchief.

![Figures 3.8-3.9: Leda Papaconstantinou and Lesley Walton, The Box, 1981, Installation-Performance, Gallery 3, Athens.](image)

Papaconstantinou and Walton inhabited the white and black boxes, respectively, and lived inside of them for four hours each day. Sometimes, they would meet in the red box to perform short actions, wearing red clothes and accessories. They both transformed their respective boxes according to their personal needs. Papaconstantinou filled her space with a number of personal objects, such as photographs, books, letters from friends and family, some of her own poems, shoes, a small mattress, Christmas lights, a mirror, a knife and a chopping board. The roof of her box was covered with small paper boats made of folded photocopies that depicted a group of women in the early 1900s (the artist’s grandmother and her friends). The specific objects were chosen because of the artist’s wish to create a friendly atmosphere and surroundings that would reflect love, tenderness and security. Walton’s room included two opposing mirror walls, a cassette player with headphones, which she sometimes shared with the viewers, and a Super 8 projector, which occasionally projected a landscape film on her body.


Wooden spools and blue ceramic hearts were scattered in the sand that was spread on the floor outside of the large box. The viewers had to cross this sand in order to reach the box and look inside using the peepholes installed on the sides of the box. For four hours every day, viewers were invited to become active voyeurs and intrude on the private lives of the
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performers; through the peepholes, they watched the two women eating, listening to music, reading, laughing, crying, etc.

The project was complemented by three additional performances that took place outside of the box. *Food for Thought* was realised in Gallery 3, after Papaconstantinou had lived in the box for five days. She spread honey on her skin and covered it with white feathers, wrapped her hair with a turban, donned a pair of mirrored sunglasses and exited the box. First, she stood next to a baby’s bathtub, which was filled with rice; then, she managed to fit her body inside it and lay still in the posture of Marat assassinated in his bath.

![Figure 3.12: Leda Papaconstantinou, The Box [Food for Thought], 1981, Installation-Performance, Gallery 3, Athens.](image1)

![Figure 3.13: Leda Papaconstantinou, The Box [The Beauty Queen], 1981, Installation-Performance, Zappeion, Athens.](image2)

*Beauty Queen* was performed in Zappeion. The artist painted her skin silver and wore a fine polythene bag over a white night-dress, a pair of Perspex stiletto heels inlaid with rhinestones, a crown made of lettuce leaves, ribbons and brightly coloured clothes-peg and mirrored sunglasses. She perched on an A-ladder, looking at a hand mirror and started ‘beautifying’ herself, liberally pouring ketchup over her head and face. After finishing the ‘beautification’ procedure, she chose one of many paperback romances from a pile by her
side and read some pages out loud in a clear voice. She then tore a page up, put in her mouth, chewed it thoroughly and spat it out.

Finally, in *Salad*, again performed in Zappeion, Papaconstantinou stretched out on the sand-covered top of the box, wearing a white night-dress and the mirrored sunglasses. Walton brought all of the ingredients necessary to prepare a salad and started working on her colleague’s body. She covered Papaconstantinou’s face and body with a thick layer of shaving cream and then added lettuce leaves, sliced lemons, onions, potato crisps, strawberries, slices of bread and salt and pepper. Thereafter, she placed wine glasses around the dish, filled them with red wine and announced that the salad was ready; she then invited the viewers to come and have a drink.

Papaconstantinou mentioned in an interview that, during the performance, profane comments were directed at the artists by male visitors to the gallery, along with written notes that featured similar content. A woman in her personal space and, in particular, when trapped in a ‘cage’, lying down, reading and/or getting dressed seems to be transformed in the male gaze from a subject to an object and, further, to a sexual object.

The installation-performance was praised in several reviews, some of which emphasised its obvious links to feminism. Although Papaconstantinou was among the first artists since the 1970s to structure her performances using a feminist approach to social criticism, at times she seemed bothered by the constant associations drawn by art critics and historians between her work and feminism. In a 2006 interview, the artist mentions ‘[o]ften, my work was linked to feminism. Such categorisations bothered me deeply because their only aim was to reduce the power of my images.’ Thus, while Papaconstantinou has been acknowledged as the most eminent feminist performance artist in Greece, she distances herself, at least at times, from an identification of her work with feminist art. The idea that the concept of feminist art deprives the artwork of some ‘ulterior essence’ has also been expressed by art critics. Nikos Xydakis, commenting on the work of Papaconstantinou, notes that, although her work could be classified as ‘women’s art’, such an ‘awkward label’ would be unjust, suggesting that her
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390 For an analysis of Papaconstantinou’s paintings see Angela Dimitrakaki, 2000.
art is instead ‘sensual, aggressive, erotic, radical, physical and political’.\textsuperscript{392} What is crucial to note at this juncture is the underestimation of feminist art as ‘awkward’, insufficiently important and not political. As a result, ‘women’s art’, which functions here as an umbrella term for all kinds of feminist art, is in fact rejected from the conceptual and theoretical spaces of artistic production and reception for the sake of a ‘sensual, erotic, aggressive…’ body art.\textsuperscript{393}

Already in 1949, in her ground-breaking work on gender, Simone de Beauvoir argued that femininity is a social construct, and therefore the practices of beautification and the use of ornamental attire imposed on women are intended to augment the female body’s incapacity and transform woman into ambiguous idols. As she explains, ‘costumes and styles are often devoted to cutting off the feminine body from activity’.\textsuperscript{394} As examples, she mentions the paradigm of the Chinese practice of binding the feet of women, resulting in them being barely able to walk and the use of high heels, corsets, panniers, farthingales and crinolines, which were allegedly intended to accentuate the curves of the female body. Makeup and jewellery also contribute to this ‘petrification of face and body’.\textsuperscript{395} As she explains, ‘the function of ornament is to make [a woman] share more intimately in nature and at the same time to remove her from the natural, it is to lend to palpitating life the rigour of artifice’.\textsuperscript{396}

Although women no longer wear panniers and crinolines, there are a number of beautification procedures that they perform, which are very often extremely painful, in order to ‘enhance’ their appearance and remain young and desirable. For a woman to be properly feminine, she is required to manipulate her appearance to conform to the very specific ideals of beauty that are dictated by each epoch and culture. Plastic surgery and eating disorders are indicative of the pressure placed on women to have ideal bodies and faces, while cosmetic overconsumption is suggestive of the embedding of rigid standards of beauty in the economy, which is dictated by capitalist markets and the advertising industry. Body fascism and the expectation of female physical perfection have been discussed by several feminist authors. In

\textsuperscript{394} Simon De Beauvoir. 1997 [1949]. The Second Sex (Vintage), 190.
\textsuperscript{395} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{396} Ibid.
The Beauty Myth, for instance, Naomi Wolf exposes today's unrealistic standards of female beauty as a destructive form of social control and a reaction against women's increasing status in business and politics. As Wolf explains, ideals serve a purpose that is both financial and political.397

In Unbearable Weight, Susan Bordo examines the ‘obsessive body practices of contemporary culture’ and suggests that these obsessions should not be portrayed as ‘bizarre or anomalous, but, rather, as the logical (if extreme) manifestations of anxieties and fantasies fostered by our culture’.398 Beautifying practices such as cosmetic surgery, obsessive dieting and physical training are indicative of how cultural ‘representations homogenise’ and how ‘these homogenised images normalise, that is, they function as models against which the self continually measures, judges, “disciplines” and “corrects” itself’.399

Papaconstantinou’s work parodies the ‘necessity’ of women’s beautification (explicitly in the case of Beauty Queen) and the stereotypical roles and duties attributed to women, such as food preparation (in Salad), developing a critical stance and resistance toward these dominant ideological constructs. On the other hand, Niki Kanaginis’s work on the practices of beautification, which is examined next, reflects a rather conciliatory approach to the same issues. While Papaconstantinou’s work demonstrates a critical approach to the production of female subjectivity, in Kanagini’s case the performances align with the constructed roles imposed on, but also adopted by, women.

Her work Female Gender, which was part of the greater project Domestic Scene, was a participatory performance realised in 1993 at the House of Cyprus (the Educational Office of the Embassy of the Republic of Cyprus in Greece) in Athens and later, in 1996, in Komotini. The artist transformed the exhibition spaces into ‘boudoirs’ and invited the female audience members to try on the available clothes and accessories. The participating women would try on clothes and see themselves reflected in a number of mirrors that were installed throughout the space. Kanagini’s exploration of gender identity and femininity lies in total contrast to the work of Papaconstantinou. Her reading of not only beautification processes but also of women’s labour in the home, as I discuss in the next section, does not suggest an intention to critique or dispute the stereotypical characteristics, behaviours, beliefs and roles attributed to

399 Ibid., 24-25.
women; rather, she embraces them by ascribing them to women’s nature, which she does through the use of an essentialist approach. In a 1993 interview, Kanagini explained that she had never been a feminist but, despite her objections to some tenets of feminist philosophy, she was strongly influenced by some of the core principles of the feminist movement. However, what troubled her at a young age and became a cause for internal conflict and confusion was feminism’s rejection of women’s nature.400

Kanagini’s view of feminine beautification as being a feminist, or, at least not an anti-feminist, practice has also been expressed by other authors. Ann Cahill, in her article ‘Feminist Pleasure and Feminine Beautification’, suggests that feminine beautification can constitute a feminist practice. Cahill maintains that there are aesthetic and inter-subjective elements within the process of beautification that ‘empower rather than disempower women’.401 In other words, according to Cahill, ‘rather than understanding beauty and beautification experiences either as wholly oppressive or as unproblematic forays into a more embodied way of being in the world’, one should explore ‘specific ways in which beautification practices can create a communal experience that furthers feminist aims’ and holds ‘promise for feminist understandings of the self.’402 Kanagini’s understanding of beautification as an intersubjective experience enjoyed by women who participate in it agrees with Cahill’s view of beautification as a communal experience: ‘the process of getting “dressed up,” especially if it is a communal, girls- or women-only undertaking, can be intensely pleasurable.’ This pleasure, Cahill argues, ‘arises from women’s embrace not of socially accepted values but of the aesthetic, embodied, and intersubjective quality of the experience’.403

However, Cahill’s arguments, like Kanagini’s participatory practice, dismiss a number of parameters related to the supposedly free will of women who have an enjoyable time in the company of other women while beautifying themselves. For instance, the act of dressing up cannot be dissociated from constructed and demanding cultural expectations regarding appearance, which are also invariably related to the ‘male gaze’.404 While Kanagini creates a space exclusively for women participants and Cahill’s reasoning relies on an event (namely, a

402 Ibid., 43.
403 Ibid., 44.
404 The term ‘male gaze’ was coined by Laura Mulvey in her 1975 essay ‘Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema’.
group of women getting dressed together in preparation for a wedding) in which women are isolated from the male gaze—and therefore, she claims, avoid sexual objectification—they are both dismissive of the internalisation of male gaze by women themselves. On the other hand, in Papaconstantinou’s *Box*, the male gaze is not only acknowledged but confronted, as the work invited participants to become voyeurs by gazing through the box’s peephole. The internalisation of the male gaze and its ramifications, reflected in Kanagini’s work, are aptly encapsulated in the words of John Berger in *Ways of Seeing*, in which he states that ‘men act and women appear. Men look at women. Women watch themselves being looked at’.\(^{405}\)

The question is thus not whether women’s beautification can be considered as feminist on the grounds that it is their personal choice and contributes to their enjoyment or whether women can beautify themselves without being objectified by the male gaze; the question to be posed is what lies behind women’s desire and choice to beautify themselves, and what are the structures that lead to women’s acquiescence to the imperatives of patriarchal ideology?

It is interesting to note that Croatian artist Sanja Iveković in her video performance *Make-Up – Make-Down* and performance *Un Jour Violente* scrutinises the mechanisms working behind the formation of female subjectivity and exposes ‘the manner in which femininity and notions of beauty are constructed, but also the way in which patriarchal power structures in both the political and social realms are created and sustained’, as Amy Bryzgel notes.\(^{406}\) In *Make-Up – Make-Down* the artist fetishised the application of cosmetics by displaying it as a sensual act. The camera focused on her cleavage and hands which caressed various beauty products, such as lipsticks and mascaras. In *Un Jour Violente* she applied make-up and dressed according to photographs shown in the magazine Marie Claire which instructs women how to have glamorous lives through their style.\(^{407}\) In contrast to Kanagini, Iveković intends to raise awareness on the ways both femininity and the desire to participate in beautification processes are constructed. Mass media and consumer culture have played an important role in the creation of ‘needs’ related to, first and foremost women’s, but also men’s appearance. Beautification in Iveković’s performances is not treated as an intersubjective procedure of having fun but rather as a condition, related to ideals promoted by the mass media, to be questioned.


\(^{407}\) Ibid.
3. Performing Domestic Labour

Beyond women’s relation to the process of beautification, Kanagini also addressed, through a series of installations under the title *Domestic Space* (1975-1991), the tasks involved in routine domestic labour that are performed by women, such as washing laundry and food preparation. With regard to this group of installations, Kanagini declared her intention to reconcile herself to the fact that women are expected to spend many hours on household labour. As she explained, at the beginning of her career, she became so frustrated in her efforts to find time to paint that she later decided that she had to combine housework and her work as an artist. Thus, she incorporated everyday house chores into her artistic work, producing, for instance, *Laundries*, as part of the series *Domestic Space*. She described this procedure of reconciliation and compromise as ‘painfully hard’ and ‘an exhausting process’ but also as ‘a catharsis’. She also noted that her work had neither an aggressive character nor conveyed the feminist premises of the time.

In 1995, she presented her work *Journey, Work and Days*, which consisted of the photographic documentation of a performance realised for a camera (without an audience). Kanagini was photographed preparing a recipe for kebabs and used the photographs that accompanied the specific recipe as part of an installation, which also included old photographs of women working in the field. The preparation and consumption of food are practices that can provide insight into both social and cultural processes. Food is related to diverse aspects of life and politics, such as identity, ethnicity, religion, reproduction, human relations, health and gender. In Kanagini’s case, however, food preparation is again presented as one of the ‘duties’ attributed to women as part of their feminine identity, without any intention to undermine it on the part of the artist. Instead, and in contrast to the subversive performances of other female artists such as Boby Baker and Martha Rosler, whose works reflect on housework labour, Kanagini presents women as consenting to the traditional gender ideology concerning the family, according to which men fulfil their family roles
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408 In the installations of the unit *Domestic Scene* Kanagini used drying racks where she hung silkscreen prints, personal and family attires, heirlooms and other objects. See Miltiades Papanikolaou, *Ιστορία της Τέχνης στην Ελλάδα. Ζωγραφική και Γλυπτική του 20ού Αιώνα [Greek Art History. Painting and Sculpture of the 20th Century]* (Vanias), 265-267.

through instrumental breadwinning activities and women fulfil their roles through nurturing, housekeeping and parenting activities.

Kanagini was aware of the feminist discourse that developed in the 1970s but chose to keep her distance from it:

Without being against the feminist movement, I have never been able to identify myself with the extreme views that have often been expressed. I know that at certain stages every movement has to be militant, but this has meant that I have not been able—even now—to consider becoming engaged in it. My own view on women is contained conceptually in my work. I shall mention here a photographic work of mine, created in 1995, which is perhaps indicative of how I view the sex to which I belong. The idea of this work sprang from my deep respect for women, and its title is *The Journey* and its subtitle *Works and Days*. My admiration is boundless for women and the wellbeing they ensure in a haven that is home, but also for their energetic and competent involvement in every kind of activity outside the home. I consider their participation a major contribution to a kind of daily libation, which sanctifies instincts and reveals *senses* that are full of purity and innocence. *The Journey* follows its course and pauses at the sense of taste, ending with a recipe or kebabs with sauce and vegetables.  

Art historian Areti Leopoulou suggests that Kanagini’s approach to women’s everyday life has certain post-feminist features. She places Kanagini’s work and intentions closer to what she calls ‘moderate feminists’, rather than those who adopted a more radical and aggressive stance in the struggle for equality. According to Leopoulou, Kanagini believed that the creative process of art is not affected by gender but can refer to it. Leopoulou therefore claims that the artist ‘accepts, accentuates and praises women’s multiple roles without any intention of protest’. The author also suggests that the artist knows that women’s entry into the workforce, in addition to the housework that they were expected to perform, made their
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lives even harder, without leading to social equality and liberation; while they secured more rights, they also multiplied their obligations.\textsuperscript{412}

Although Leopoulou rightly claims that Kanagini’s work is not intended as a protest, since, as mentioned previously, it does not react against gender stereotypes but instead embraces and praises them, the framework of post-feminism within which Leopoulou places the artist’s work is problematic, as the term ‘post-feminist’ is rather ambiguous and confusing. Post-feminism is a term that has been used, mainly since the 1990s, to describe a diverse range of concepts. It may refer to the continuation of feminism in a new stage or to a reaction to and critique of previous feminist discourses in general and second-wave feminism in particular. Amelia Jones has noted that the post-feminist texts of the late 1980s and 1990s were overly general in their criticism, portraying second-wave feminism as a monolithic entity.\textsuperscript{413} Yet post-feminism is most commonly associated with the idea that feminism is no longer relevant to today’s society because of the conviction that feminism has accomplished its goals, and it is thus now time to move beyond feminist politics. However, as Angela Dimitrakaki notes, this conviction was based on a designation of women as powerful consumers, the problematic doctrine of ‘free choice’, the marginalisation of any discourse related to class division and, centrally, to the reference to the values of Western society.\textsuperscript{414}

The rhetoric of post-feminism has been used by several Greek art historians, but it is not always clear what meaning they attributed to it. Charis Kanelopoulou, curator of the exhibition \textit{Women in Visual Arts 1960-1980: Their Contribution to the Greek Avant-garde}, which was held between 2014 and 2015, made the following note in the exhibition catalogue:

\begin{quote}
Although we live in the so-called post-feminist era, in which we consider that any historically, socially, culturally and ideologically arisen adversities and dichotomies regarding gendered identity have mainly been beat, the debate on whether the legacy and historical ‘validity’ of an artist
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{412} Ibid.
are equal to brand name and oeuvre and not gender, seems to maintain its interest, even to date.\textsuperscript{415}

Although it is not clear whether or not the author agrees with the concept of post-feminism or presents it as something that others claim to be valid, it seems quite incongruous to maintain that, in 2014, we live in a post-feminist era, as feminist activism, discourse and art had been experiencing a resurgence for at least ten years.\textsuperscript{416} In 2007, art historians Elpida Karaba and Kostis Stafylakis noted the widespread belief that nowadays we live in a post-feminist era in which we are heading towards the transcendence of sexual differences and gender identities and that the basic goals of historical feminist movements have been, to a great extent, accomplished; thus, activist measures seem pointless. The art historians maintain that such a belief is not completely wrong, but it is problematic to believe that we have magically entered into an era in which the fundamental issues of second-wave feminism can be considered pointless. However, later in their text, they do use the term to define women’s performative practices of the 2000s.\textsuperscript{417}

To return to Kanagini’s work, it seems pointless to situate it within a post-feminist framework since post-feminism, the stage in which the demands of second-wave feminism were fulfilled, was, in fact, never realised. It is also interesting to note that Leopoulou maintains that Kanagini, who belonged to the upper class, probably had fewer problems (the author does not specify what kind of problems) to face compared to lower-class women, who were more restricted both financially and socially. Referencing sociologist Ann Oakley, Leopoulou suggests that the fact that Kanagini was not an aggressive feminist and claimed to enjoy housework makes sense, as she was not that oppressed when compared to the lower classes.\textsuperscript{418} However, a more careful reading of Oakley’s research on women’s stances and feelings towards housework makes it obvious that dissatisfaction with housework does not vary by class. According to her findings, no class differences were identified in ‘the incidence of dissatisfaction with housework, attitudes to work tasks, the specification of standards and routines and identification with the housewife role’.\textsuperscript{419} On the contrary, however,


\textsuperscript{417} Karaba and Stafylakis, 2007, 7.

\textsuperscript{418} Leopoulou, 2014, 68.

considerable class differences were shown in response to the question ‘Do you like housework?’ As Oakley explains, it was predominately working-class women who claimed to ‘like’ or ‘not mind’ the housework. Such statements symbolise ‘an attachment to the norm of feminine satisfaction with housework’. As she explains,

while similar feelings about housework are shared by working-class and middle-class housewives, their orientation to the housewife role tends to differ. The working class orientation is, on the whole, more positive: there is a strong motivation to declare a personal identification with domesticity, and this, in turn, leads to a search for satisfaction in housework.

Correspondingly, the middle class tendency is toward a disengagement from the housewife role on a verbal and cognitive level; instead of a striving for satisfaction with housework, there tends to be an acknowledgment that dissatisfaction with housework exists. In other words, what Oakley’s research shows is that, while women of all classes are dissatisfied with domestic work, the middle classes acknowledge this dissatisfaction, while the working class denies it. This conclusion contradicts what Leopoulou claims, namely that it is characteristic of the middle and upper classes to declare less dissatisfaction with housework than the lower class.

What is thus exposed through Kanagini’s performative gestures, with regard to both housework and beautification, is the way in which women internalise their own oppression. As Oakley explains, the reason for this is that the structures that oppress women cannot be changed unless there a prior awareness of the need for change exists among women: ‘The strategy of raising awareness is most needed in the case of the housewife, and it is precisely the failure to develop it which has negated or reduced the appeal of the [feminist] movement in this area.’ Performance, in this case, is not realised as carrier of radical ideas but instead of conservative ones; it does not present the constructed and imposed feminine roles, as in the case of Papaconstantinou. It presents women’s consent to the imposition of the role.

Although Oakley’s research was conducted during the 1970s, the issue of housework as unpaid labour that is imposed on women remains crucial today. In fact, during recent years, it has been discussed extensively (though not so much in Greece) in terms of affective labour,
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which encompasses not only domestic labour but also the other forms of affective labour that women are expected to engage in on a daily basis, both inside and outside the home.\footnote{423} Female identity has been inextricably connected to the idea of women as providers who serve the lives of others, acting as the nurturers and care-givers of the family. The International Wages for Housework Campaign, initiated by the International Feminist Collective in Italy, which was established by Silvia Federici, Seima James, Brigitte Galtier and Mariarosa Dalla Costa, was a 1972 global social movement founded to raise awareness of the issue of housework and childcare representing forms of unpaid intensive labour and to demand economic compensation for domestic work. However, demanding compensation for domestic labour was not the only objective of the campaign: Such demands were intended to draw attention to the various forms of affective labour that women perform daily as the basis of all industrial work and the reliance of capitalist economies on exploitative labour practices.\footnote{424} Kanagini’s inclusion of housework in her artistic work therefore reveals a completely different approach to domestic labour than that which appears in the work of the well-known artists Martha Rosler and Bobby Baker. In *Semiotics of the Kitchen* (1975), Rosler performs a parodic cooking demonstration in which the traditional and familiar role of woman as a provider of food, which was praised in Kanagini’s work, is subverted.\footnote{425} The woman in the kitchen does not defend or enjoy her role as housewife; instead, she uses a lexicon of rage and frustration, while her actions with kitchen utensils depart from their familiar uses. Her performance disrupts conventional notions concerning women’s roles and their relationship to the home. *Semiotics of the Kitchen* subverts the concept of cooking as a caring activity and destabilises the existing signs of domesticity.

In a similarly defiant mood, Bobby Baker’s performances of daily life in the late 1980s and 1990s focus on the conflict between women’s roles as mothers, workers and housewives, which was totally absent in Kanagini’s work. In Baker’s case, humour, but also anger, is

\footnote{423} It should be noted though that within the framework of Documenta 14, Angela Dimitrakaki and Antonia Majaca organised an event (30/6−1/7/2017) responding to Sanja Iveković’s *Monument to Revolution* to reflect on the marginalisation of ‘women’s work’ in twentieth-century struggles alongside the feminisation of labour today in art and the neoliberal economy overall.


\footnote{426} For a description of the work see Peggy Phelan and Helena Reckitt (eds). 2012. *Art and Feminism* (Phaidon), 87.
deployed by the artist in her performative protests, which focus on the need for social transformation in women’s lives. Food preparation and domesticity combine with ‘comic playing and the hysterical marking of the body’ in Baker’s performances, which address the domestic and maternal narrative of isolation, frustration, and confinement experienced by women, which second-wave feminism focused on during the 1970s.\textsuperscript{426} The myth of the Superwoman—the working mother who could successfully combine professional, family and personal lives—that was promoted during the 1980s and 1990s through the ideology of postfeminism and was often internalised by women is mocked in Drawing on a Mother’s Experience (1988) and in her 1990s Daily Life series, which includes Kitchen Show (1991) and How to Shop (1993). Baker, in contrast to Kanagini, stresses both the monotony of the time-consuming and labour-intensive household tasks and the embarrassment of the abject, reproductive body.\textsuperscript{427}

The subject of domestic labour has been explored in a different manner by a group of female artists called ‘The Girls’, which was founded in Greece in April 2014. Persephone Nikolakopoulou, Giota Georgopoulou, Thalia Zachariadou, Eleni Oikonomou and Fotini Kalle, as ‘The Girls’, usually engage in site-specific projects and guerrilla public interventions. In 2014, the group performed a public intervention in front of the Greek Parliament that addressed the issue of maintenance activities and challenged the public, specifically passers-by, to think critically about the labour-intensive chore of cleaning, which is often claimed to be unimportant. The four women then started cleaning the marbled pavement in front of the Greek Parliament. Within five minutes, policemen threatened to arrest the artists: The Girls were treated as a threat, even though the policemen themselves could not justify why they were a threat. The artists had to run away so as to avoid being arrested.\textsuperscript{428}

The cleaning, a common activity, apparently took place at an inappropriate time and space. The simple and silent performance of this specific domestic chore was converted into a threat. It should be noted, however, that this performance took place shortly after the cleaners working for the country’s universities were fired by the government due to the austerity measures, and the universities were consequently crowded with piles of garbage. Within such a context, The Girls’ action could be read as a symbolic gesture of support for the cleaners. Yet, their action cannot but also be related to the well-known series of performances under the title Maintenance Work, which were produced in the US by Mierle Landerman Ukeles—the ‘preeminent garbage girl’, as described by Lucy Lippard—between 1973 and 1976, in which she performed maintenance activities in public spaces, such as cleaning streets and museum floors. These performances emphasised the necessity and significance of such activities but also of the people who carry them out and who are ignored in cultural discourse. Moreover, Ukeles’s actions exposed art museums as spaces in which women’s labour was intensely exploited. In a sense, the artist’s performance exposed the invisible but extremely necessary ‘performance’ of working-class people, which is what The Girls also did. In her manifesto ‘Maintenance Art’ (1969), Ukeles described the hard labour involved

in maintenance activities and, in order to address their significance, she posed an apt question: ‘After the revolution, who is going to take out the garbage on Monday morning?’

The Girls, though aware of Ukeles’s performances, did not have her in mind when they decided to perform the cleaning, as it was a swift and spontaneous decision. As Foteini Kalle, a member of the group, explains, they only thought of Ukeles’ work afterwards. It is important to also note that, in response to my question regarding the possibly feminist identity of the group, Kalle stated that they are not particularly interested in claiming a feminist identity per se; yet, since all the members are women, it is plausible that they often engage with issues related to gender and comment on them, even if indirectly, from a female perspective. The distancing from a feminist identity is frustrating, however, as it is indicative of the general stance most Greek female artists have adopted towards such an identity.

4. Bodies of Patience and Obedience

Angeliki Avgitidou, in her performance *Patience* (2012), which was performed in a room of her apartment and transmitted live for the 4th Biennale of Chile, repeatedly and patiently folded and unfolded a piece of cloth for several minutes while uttering the word ‘patience’ in different voices, tones, moods and volume. Patience is said to be the ability to wait for something or for an event to take place without becoming anxious or angry. Waiting with patience is a supposed ‘virtue’, which is disproportionately expected of women, as is passivity. As Avgitidou notes in relation to her performance,

> Patience is what is asked of us. Patience contains a promise. This promise is for a long anticipated change. Patience includes a prolonging of waiting. Patience contains endurance. Patience is connected with suffering but also sympathy and acknowledgement of the other. Stereotypically associated with women, patience is present in women’s efforts, lament and predicaments. In this performance the different voices of Patience, internal

---


432 Communication with the author (16/2/2016).
and external, will be heard. Voices will overlap, compete, be silent and submit. Which voice is mine? What am I being patient for?433

The traditional image of women promoted by the Greek Orthodox Church (among other bodies) has been that of the wife and mother who passively and good-naturedly endures, with patience, all of the problems that she and her family face, who does not question her traditional role and who only offers her help and care to the other members of the family and, especially, to her children, to whom she ought to be utterly devoted, without asking for anything in return. In Greek society, in which the Church is identified with the nation, the aforementioned characteristics of a woman’s identity are considered as part of her nature; thus, when women deviate from this specific model, they may be considered as being deviant.434

Forty years ago, in her performance Waiting (1972), Faith Wilding addressed the same issues concerning the concept of patience, which is inextricably associated with waiting; therefore, women are required and expected to wait for something or someone throughout their lives. The artist sat, passively, with her hands in her lap and rocked back and forth as she listed examples of the endless waiting involved in a woman’s life.435 In a fifteen-minute monologue, performed as part of the programme at the Womanhouse project in Los Angeles, Wilding emphasised the monotonous, repetitive cycle of waiting for life to begin that women experience while serving the lives of others life (e.g. waiting to be beautiful, to be loved, to get married, to have a baby, to raise children, to be beautiful again and for something to happen).436 The fact that Wilding was invited to re-enact Waiting in 2007 and 2008 indicates a need for such issues to be addressed again, even after so many years, not only in Greece but also globally.437

436 Womanhouse was a Feminist Art Programme in California and one of the most important sites for the making and theorising of feminist art. See Amelia Jones. 2012. ‘Faith Wilding, Waiting and Wait-With’ in Amelia Jones and Adrian Heathfield (eds), Perform, Repeat, Record: Live Art in History (University of Chicago Press and Intellect), 253-258. Faith Wilding’s poem Waiting can also be found online, http://faithwilding.refugia.net/waitingpoem.pdf [accessed 15/4/2017].
Avgitidou and Wilding’s repetitive and monotonous actions could be seen as an encapsulation and visualisation of Judith Butler’s theory of gender performativity, according to which gender is constructed through repetitive acts of gender performance: Gender is ‘a stylised repetition of acts . . . which are internally discontinuous . . . [so that] the appearance of substance is precisely that, a constructed identity, a performatively accomplished which the mundane social audience, including the actors themselves, come to believe and to perform in the mode of belief’. 438

Yet there is another way in which patience and tolerance can be viewed, besides their link to women. Promises of improvement and social change are always accompanied in political rhetoric by reminders of the importance of patience, particularly, in Greece’s case, since the economic crisis. Patience is not only associated with waiting but also with tolerance. As Slavoj Žižek has noted, many problems today are perceived as problems of intolerance, rather than as problems of inequality, exploitation and injustice: ‘Why is the proposed remedy tolerance, rather than emancipation, political struggle, even armed struggle?’ he asks. 439 The immediate answer lies, according to the philosopher, ‘in the liberal multiculturalist’s basic

---


ideological operation: the “culturalisation of politics”. Political differences—differences conditioned by political inequality or economic exploitation—are naturalised and neutralised into “cultural” differences, that is into different “ways of life” which are something given, something that cannot be overcome. They can only be tolerated. Tolerance thus becomes a ‘post-political ersatz’ because of the failure of direct political solutions. In a similar manner, gender differences, which are characterised by inequality and exploitation, are naturalised through patriarchal values and are often considered as given, even by women themselves.

On the other hand, patience and passivity, when framed differently and within a broader context, can also be viewed as reactive and capable of functioning in a critical manner. When Wilding was asked to re-enact Waiting, she decided instead to re-envision the piece, focusing on a more positive reading of the potential of waiting as a ‘non-violent action, as a possibility of identification with activists who have staged waiting demonstrations as political actions…I’m trying to investigate ideas about positive uses of passivity, of refusal to act or produce’. Her new text ‘Waiting With’ depicted waiting as an act of resistance, reflection and refusal. Passivity has also been defended as a form of resistance in the literature. Alain Badiou argues that ‘[i]t is better to do nothing than to contribute to the invention of formal ways of rendering visible that which Empire already recognises as existent’. Likewise, for Žižek it is

better to do nothing than to engage in localised acts whose ultimate function is to make the system run smoother (acts like providing the space for the multitude of new subjectivities, etc.) The threat today is not passivity, but pseudo-activity, the urge to ‘be active’, to ‘participate’, to mask the Nothingness of what goes on. People intervene all the time, ‘do something’, academics participate in meaningless ‘debates’, etc., and the truly difficult thing is to step back, to withdraw from it. Those in power often prefer even a ‘critical’ participation, a dialogue, to silence—just to

440 Ibid.
441 Ibid.
engage us in a “dialogue,” to make it sure our ominous passivity is broken.\textsuperscript{445}

Conclusions

Chapter 3 has examined four aspects related to gender politics through the performative work of Greek women artists: reproduction, beauty, domestic labour and patience/ passivity. Although a feminist approach can be applied to the performative work of Greek women artists, in most cases they distance themselves from a feminist identity, as it has been shown. Such an attitude aligns with women’s compliance and consent to live and behave according to the patriarchal ideology’s demands. Performing all kinds of free work, such as domestic and affective labour and subjecting themselves to (sometimes extreme) beautifying practices without developing any kind of resistance, are just indicative examples.

The fact that although some women have been fighting for equal rights and struggling against their exploitation for years now, many women still refuse to identify themselves as feminists requires further examination. Although I discussed the notion of symbolic violence as defined by Slavoj Žižek in Chapter 1 and in relation to the production of biopolitical violence within capitalist structures, in this chapter I will draw on Pierre Bourdieu’s definition and exploration of symbolic violence in an attempt to address women’s internalisation of oppression which leads to their consent to their own oppression.

It is well known that the greater the immersion in an ideology the greater the inability to see beyond it. In fact, national and cultural ideologies become so familiar that are eventually internalised and considered natural. Symbolic violence in the work of Bourdieu is not just a form of violence operating symbolically. It is the violence ‘which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity’.\textsuperscript{446} Gender relations are the paradigm case of the operation of symbolic violence since both men and women concur with the idea of male hegemony. This sort of violence has become inherent to both men and women’s interactions and social relations. Bourdieu in \textit{Masculine Domination} (1998) attempts to explain the mechanisms under which the ‘most intolerable conditions of existence can so often be perceived as

\textsuperscript{445} Žižek, 2009, 183.

acceptable and even natural’.\(^{447}\) As he explains, he sees masculine domination and the way it is imposed and suffered as the prime example of this paradoxical submission, an effect of what he calls

symbolic violence, a gentle violence imperceptible and invisible even to its victims exerted for the most part through the purely symbolic channels of communication and cognition (more precisely, misrecognition), recognition, or even feeling. This extraordinarily ordinary social relation thus offers a privileged opportunity to grasp the logic of the domination exerted in the name of a symbolic principle known and recognised both by the dominant and by the dominated - a language (or a pronunciation), a lifestyle (or a way of thinking, speaking and acting) - and, more generally, a distinctive property, whether emblem or stigma, the symbolically most powerful of which is that perfectly arbitrary and non-predictive bodily property, skin colour.\(^{448}\)

Despite the ‘invisibility’ of symbolic violence, it is one of the most powerful weapons in the imposition of masculine domination since it allows and fosters the conditions for more direct and explicit forms of violence, whether economic or physical.

Another powerful weapon that contributes not only to male hegemony but also to women’s alignment with masculine superiority is capitalism. Silvia Federici illustrates the subtle violence of housework and sexual servicing, the unacknowledged reproductive labour of women and the problematic equitation of waged work with emancipation arguing that under neoliberal globalisation women’s exploitation intensifies. According to Federici it is capitalism that naturalises women’s exploitation since capital normalises women’s labour as housework that does not need to be recognised either economically or socially.\(^{449}\)

Finally, a third factor that could be constituent to the naturalisation and internalisation of women’s exploitation, at least in the case of Greece, is the fact that religious life, which as discussed promotes male hegemony, is still considered a fundamental aspect of life for the greatest portion of the Greek population. According to the Eurostat Eurobarometer poll, in 2005, 81% of Greek citizens believed there is a God, whereas 16% ‘believed there is some

\(^{448}\) Ibid., 1-2.
\(^{449}\) See Federici, 2012.
sort of spirit or life force’ and only 3% did not believe there is a ‘God, spirit, nor life force’. This makes Greece the third most religious country in the European Union.\footnote{Eurobarometer, ‘Social values, Science and Technology’, June 2005, \url{http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_225_report_en.pdf} [accessed 12/1/2017]. A more recent poll indicates that 71% of the Greek population claim to be religious while only a 6% claim to be atheists. Ethimios Hatzioannou. 2005. Elfiniki-gnomi, \url{http://www.elliniki-gnomi.eu/megali-dimoskopiki-erevna-se-65-chores-tou-kosmou-edixe-oti-peripou-6-stous-10-anthropous-se-olon-ton-planiti-aftoprosdiorizonte-os-thriskevomeni-eno-i-athei-ke-i-ni-thriskevomeni-antistichoun-sto-3/} [accessed 12/1/2017].} The Greek Orthodox Church is still, in 2017, under the protection of the State, which pays the clergy’s salaries. While complete separation of church and state has been proposed at times, all the governing parties have so far decided not to open this controversial matter, which clashes with both the population and the clergy.\footnote{For instance, numerous protests occurred over the removal of the Religious Denomination entry from the National ID card in 2000.} A recent survey (2016) also indicated that 54% of the Greek population makes a strong connection between nationality and Christianity supporting that it is very important to be Christian in order to be a true national.\footnote{Bruce Stokes, 1 February 2017, ‘4. Faith: Few Strong Links to National Identity’, \textit{Pew Research Centre: Global Attitudes and Trends}, \url{http://www.pewglobal.org/2017/02/01/faith-few-strong-links-to-national-identity/} [accessed 12/2/2017].}

The question is, how can resistance to dominant ideological constructs be encouraged? Of course the fact that the complexity of the persistently undervalued affective labour of women inside and outside the home, remains marginalised in feminist debates and in public discourse in general, in the case of Greece, along with the evident lack of an education concerned with gender politics and feminist issues, makes the situation even more problematic.
Part II.

Diversifying Performance: Community Inclusion, Experience Economy and the Document
Chapter 4

Performance in the Expanded Field: Community Engaged Art and the ‘Absence’ of the Artist

Introduction

It is well known that since the beginning of the 1990s, there has been a shift within the field of art towards collaboration, public participation and collectivism, which has destabilised the way art is being produced and exhibited. In parallel to this emphasis on process instead of product, artists in the western world—but also in Greece, in particular—have shown great interest in exposing the challenging realities of minority communities by incorporating them in their artistic practice. Such post-performance practices integrate diverse modes of participation and/or collaboration and may have different aims and outcomes. However, as Grant Kester has noted, they all ‘unfold through a process of performative interaction’—or wish to do so, I would add—unlike the object-based artworks which are produced exclusively by the artist and only afterwards offered to the viewer.453 The aspiration to achieve such performative interaction is also a key element of performance art, and the lack of it is the main reason many scholars consider the documentation stemming from it as secondary and inferior or unequal to the live event (this concept is examined in the next chapter). However, in the case of community-based art, and in contrast to performance art, the artist is allegedly no longer at the centre of the ‘stage’ during this performative interaction, but rather backstage, producing art as co-author and organiser, instructor, or director of a project. Artists and non-artists are supposed to become participants in a collaborative, performative, and interactive process which becomes indistinguishable from life itself. Yet is that interaction truly actualised? Moreover, is this performative interaction so important and crucial for both the community and the artist? Is there some intrinsic or instrumental value in the experience offered to the participant communities?

Henri Bergson, in his essay on the perception of change, notes that for hundreds of years ‘there have been men whose function has been precisely to see and to make us see what we

do not naturally perceive. They are the artists’. Bergson goes on to ask what the aim of art is ‘if not to show us, in nature and in the mind, outside of us and within us, things which did not explicitly strike our senses and our consciousness’.

Although many artists engaging in collaborative practices (at least the ones included in this chapter) seem to prioritise such an aim, it would be too optimistic to claim that they always achieve it. Raising the visibility of underrepresented groups and promoting their social integration through the unveiling of the ‘unseen’ is a complex task, entailing a number of complications. The participation of communities (or even diverse publics) in artistic practices is part of a broader methodology adopted by artists in their endeavour to, as Yannis Stavrakakis and Kostis Stafylakis put it, re-establish the social nexus and create conditions of collective experience in radical ways.

A number of art theorists have analysed the features of such participatory projects that aim at communication, prolific dialogue, collective experience and production; they have coined various terms to define their forms and aspirations. Already in 1995, Suzanne Lacy used the term ‘New Genre Public Art’ to distinguish public art that addresses social issues and blurs the clear distinction between artist and viewer from public art as simply sculpture in public places. In the same publication, Suzi Gablik coined the term ‘connective aesthetics’ and highlighted the ‘beneficial and healing role’ of social interaction incorporated into artistic practices, such as in Jonathan Borofsky and Gary Glassman’s video documentary *Prisoners* and Suzanne Lacy’s *The Crystal Quilt*. Listening instead of observing is a core element of connective aesthetics, according to Gablik. Moreover, Mary Jane Jacobs underlined the aim of participatory art to ‘make a lasting impact on the lives of the individuals involved, be of productive service to the social network, or contribute to remedying the social problem.’

A few years later, in 1998, Nicolas Bourriaud’s essay on ‘relational aesthetics’, through the work of Philippe Parreno, Carsten Höller, Henry Bond, Douglas Gordon and others, set the focus on human relations and social environments where people come together to share an

---
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Grant Kester chose a disparate network of artists and collectives, such as WochenKlausur, Suzanne Lacy, Helen and Newton Harrison, Littoral and Stephen Willats, to address the intersection of art and cultural activism. He also highlighted the desire to create new forms of understanding through creative dialogue that crosses boundaries of race, religion, and culture. Kester’s ‘dialogic art’ deemed discourse as the form and crucial element of these works of art.\(^{461}\) On the other hand, several theorists have also pointed out the weaknesses and impossibilities of such projects. In the essay ‘The Artist as Ethnographer’ (1995), Hal Foster critiqued the ways in which contemporary art has engaged methodological strategies from anthropology and has explicated the collaborative interaction between artists and local communities in ethnographic terms.\(^{462}\) In her article ‘Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics’ (2004) Claire Bishop adopted Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe’s theory of antagonism as the essence of democracy and argued about the impossibility of some participatory projects—mainly related to conviviality—to promote the democratic ideal since they do not sustain but rather erase relations of conflict. For Miwon Kwon, while these collaborations with collective entities should raise questions, unsettle the viewers and make them uncomfortable, they seem more likely to ‘affirm rather than disturb the viewer’s sense of self’.\(^{463}\) The plurality of the coined terms and the diversity of aspects the art scholars above address are indicative of the long discussions and disagreements over collaborative art projects.

The performative and ‘social turn’ in the visual arts of the early 1990s became evident in Greece a few years later, in the late 1990s to early 2000s, and coincided with institutions’ conspicuous, though belated, surge of interest in the field of contemporary art, as explained in Chapter 1.\(^{464}\) As Angela Dimitrakaki explains, collectives such as WochenKlausur and Superflux aim not only to produce communication but also to directly improve the living conditions of specific communities through activating local agents and a ‘collaborative

---


\(^{462}\) See Hal Foster. 1996. ‘The Artist as Ethnographer’, *The Return of the Real* (Massachusetts Institute of Technology).


\(^{464}\) The term was first coined by Clair Bishop in her article ‘The Social Turn: Collaboration and its Discontents’, *Artforum* (February 2006).
In Greece, art’s ‘social turn’ was identified from the outset with artists’ greater interest in collaborative practices and the inclusion of minority/local communities in the artistic process. However, the latest persistent call for an art that is useful and identifies with a new socio-political activism by intervening in the political and economic reality of society encounters impediments in its actualisation in Greece, as I elaborate in the first part of this chapter.

Overall, Chapter 4 examines three case studies. The first part of the chapter examines the project *T.A.M.A.* (1998–2002) initiated by the artist Maria Papadimitriou. *T.A.M.A.* was actualised in collaboration with professionals from diverse disciplines and with the participation of the Roma residents of Avliza, in the outskirts of Athens. The second part of the chapter explores the project *Egnatia Road: A Path of Displaced Memories* organised by the Italian collective Stalker. The project was co-funded by the European Commission programme Culture 2000 and was developed through the establishment of agencies in several European cities such as Athens, Istanbul, Rome and Paris. The part of the project realised in Greece involved the participation of several Greek and Italian artists in collaboration with art group Savra (Greek for lizard). In both projects, the process of production and the assumed encouragement of dialogue and relations constitute the artworks themselves (sometimes partly and other times completely). In the third part, I analyse Marios Spiliopoulos’s monumental installation *Human Trace* (2008), a project in which collaboration constituted the means of art production but not the artwork itself. The project comprises two installations: one that was site-specific in the old soap factory in Eleusina and another one in Thessaloniki, produced with the help of local residents. The questions raised throughout the chapter concern the extent to which the desired or pursued participation of a community is in fact consequential and the terms under which this participation and collaboration are being realised. In what ways is the alleged interaction taking place? Moreover, I elaborate on the issue of whether or not the artist’s authorship as sole producer of the work is in fact undermined through this new means of art production with its promise of destabilising the artist–spectator relationship. Finally, I discuss the potentialities and complications of the specific artworks in order to examine whether such projects could be deemed sites of resistance.
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465 Angela Dimitrakaki. 2013. *Τέχνη και Παγκοσμιοποίηση, Από το Μεταμοντέρνο Σημείο στη Βιοπολιτική Αρένα* [Art and Globalisation: From the Postmodern Sign to the Biopolitical Arena], 232-233.
1. Temporary Autonomous Museum for All

1.1 The Artwork

The first case study is the community-based, public art project *T.A.M.A.* by the artist Maria Papadimitriou, initiated in 1998 in Avliza, an isolated location at the outskirts of Athens occupied by nomadic populations of Roma and Vlacho-Romanian Greeks. *T.A.M.A.* stands for *Temporary Autonomous Museum for All*. The title of the project alludes to the lack of a national museum of contemporary art in Greece at the time. Though long discussions about founding a national museum of contemporary art in Athens had been taking place for many years, only in 2000 was the museum established.\(^{466}\) As Papadimitriou wandered around the shacks in Avliza in search of antique furniture, she envisioned the place as a kind of museum full of readymade artworks. She took photos of specific objects like furniture, boxes and shacks that reminded her works of Martin Kippenberger, Thomas Schütte, Damien Hirst, Thomas Hirschhorn and Jannis Kounellis, and she invited her friends to visit the place. Soon enough the *Temporary Autonomous Museum for All* was intended to function as an open platform, a ‘museum without walls’, as André Malraux has put it, that would bring together artists and other professionals, the Roma community and the public through organised events such as meetings, meals and workshops.\(^{467}\) Yet, apart from cultivating social (and perhaps friendly) relations between the Roma and the people involved, Papadimitriou, along with some of her collaborators, put together a proposal for an infrastructural plan adapted to the needs and lifestyle of nomadic populations which, however, was never realised.\(^{468}\) The *T.A.M.A.* catalogue does not specify whether this plan was intended to be realised as part of

\(^{466}\) In fact, the museum was established in 1997 but has been partially operating since 2000 though without having its own building to do so. It was temporarily hosted at the Athens Concert Hall ‘Megaron’ and the Athens Conservatoire up until 2016 when the building of the former brewery FIX was finally ready to be used as the museum space. Up to now (April 2017) the museum is only partially open for specific exhibitions/events while its permanent collection is not exhibited yet. For the long debates in regard to the establishment of a museum of contemporary art in Greece see Gerogianni, Irene. 2013. ‘Όταν “Οι Καλλιτέχνες Συζητούσαν Αθήνα”: Τοποθετήσεις, Υποθέσεις, Διερευνήσεις για ένα Μουσείο Σύγχρονης Τέχνης στην Ελλάδα’ [When "Artists Chatted Incessantly": Positionings, Premises, Investigations for a Museum of Contemporary Art in Greece ’]. *Κριτική + Τέχνη* [Critique + Art], 05: 124-141.

\(^{467}\) André Malraux introduced in 1967 the concept of ‘le musée imaginaire’ (usually translated into English as ‘the museum without walls’ or ‘the imaginary museum’), which espoused visualizing art without the traditional confines (and constructs) of the museum grouping. See André Malraux [Translated in English by S. Gilbert and F. Price]. 1967. *Museum without Walls* (Martin Secker & Warburg).

\(^{468}\) The proposed infrastructure included designs for a reception, a family house, public baths, a dormitory for visitors, invited researchers, artists, etc., a compact building transformable to accommodate professional training workshops, educational and recreation facilities for the local people, first aid station, counseling services, open-air cinema, toilets, etc., a market building, a classroom and a restaurant. *T.A.M.A.*, 60-75.
the actual artwork or conceived as an imaginary utopian space. Arguably, the relationship between the intentions for the project and what constituted the artwork is imbued with ambiguity.

In my analysis, I elucidate the question of what was indeed the aim of the project. Was it to subvert the Roma’s invisibility and marginalisation through their embracement and integration into an art project, or to propose and actualise a plan aiming to improve the living conditions of the community? Could this project effectuate a moment of disruption in the normative ideological flow and provoke the subversion of given values and stereotypes related to the Roma minority?

In her personal description of the concept, process and intention of her project, the artist stated the following:

T.A.M.A. is located in Avliza, a run-down area in western Athens, 10 km away from the centre of the capital and very close to the new Olympic village. Itinerant populations such as Gypsies and Vlach Romanians from north of Greece use this area as a pied-à-terre. My discovery was accidental, but my involvement was intentional. It came as a natural sequence of my attitude as an artist. I visited the place for the first time in 1998 with my friends Catherine and Michel, looking for old furniture at good prices. But when I found myself there, it was not the antiques that attracted me but the place itself; haphazard layout, unexpected events, unplanned art works, strange people. What I saw there is the concept of a makeshift settlement, a kind of mobile post-urban city which serves its inhabitants’ temporary housing needs and economic activities. Everything forms part of this small town. Landscape—clothes—interiors—unfinished buildings—streets—cars—the sky—the people. I started to visit Avliza every day—I became an addicted visitor. The observation of place and people became my foremost duty. I wanted to become friends with them, to participate in their fiestas, to share their problems, to listen to their thoughts and needs; after a long time I had it, and a strong relationship started. The nomadic way of living and the particularities of the community gave me the idea of setting a system of communication and exchange among the inhabitants, myself, the art people and the public. In a
very short time I realised that all my friends and associates wanted to participate in this story which I call the temporary autonomous museum for all.469

This is how the artist describes how she became acquainted with the settlement in Avliza in 1998 and how the art project *T.A.M.A.* came into being. Papadimitriou chose the place because of its ‘peculiarity’ and was attracted to the ‘unexpected events’ and ‘strange people’—descriptions which reveal her attraction to an exotic ‘Other’.470 Hence, the project’s initiative was based on the romanticised image of the Gypsies wandering freely with their caravans and living liberated from any social constraints. Although the artist’s account does not directly identify the project’s aims, Papadimitriou does mention that she wished to ‘become friends with them, to participate in their fiestas, to share their problems, to listen to their thoughts and needs’ and set up ‘a system of communication and exchange’ among the inhabitants, herself, the art professionals and the public. Thus, the development of personal relations with the community and the establishment of a system of communication were her intentions, at least at the beginning of the project.

1.2 Abject Subjects

Before analysing the way *T.A.M.A.* evolved, it is imperative to consider the social position of the Roma communities generally in Europe, but especially in Greece. The words ‘unwanted’, ‘exclusion’ and ‘persecution’ that often accompany references to Roma in the press are indicative of their position in the social fabric. Their placement at the margins of the social structure is also reflected in their settlement at the margins of residential areas, signifying an interdependence between social and spatial-geographical marginalisation.

Many Romani avoid assimilation within the larger societies of their host countries, and this intensifies their isolation. They typically lack access to stable jobs, health care, affordable housing and other social services. Social isolation, constant travelling and poor living conditions also create serious impediments to Roma children’s integration to schools.


470 As Eva Fotiadi notes, ‘despite the artist’s intentions, respect and commitment towards Avliza’s inhabitants, the project essentially reproduced the aestheticisation of Roma people as fascinating, exotic “Other,” and their marginalisation as a social minority dependent upon a mediating agency to represent their interests to Greek society’, Eva Fotiadi. 2011. *The Game of Participation in Art and the Public Sphere*, 126.
Consequently, the level of illiteracy among the Roma is high. In addition and in relation to the above, poverty and crime often plague Roma communities.

Another major issue concerning discrimination against the Roma is the government policies about women and reproductive rights. Though not in Greece, until recently, compulsory sterilisation programs were carried out by the governments in countries such as Sweden, Finland, Norway, Czech Republic and Slovakia. Many Roma women admitted to having been sterilised without their consent just after they had given birth. Many women in the Czech Republic were offered money, though that was not official policy. Some Roma women signed consent forms without realising what the operation entailed, while others simply did not understand what the word ‘sterilisation’ meant. Most Roma women are illiterate (the percentage is much higher than in men) and restricted to the traditional role of woman as wife and mother, imposed by the Roma society. The family relations are hierarchical, men having a privileged position while women are considered inferior. In traditional communities, girls usually get married between the ages of 14 to 16 (boys by 18 years) and have repeated childbirths at young ages. In many cases, women are bought off by the husband’s family, and in all cases they have to be virgins.

The Roma presently living in Greece can be classified into groups according to their genealogy, profession, housing conditions, level of integration with the Greek society, profession, housing conditions, level of integration with the Greek society,

471 A significant issue raised is whether the Roma are hostile towards school or the education system makes the school hostile towards the Roma. For more information see Αναπτυξιακή Σύμπραξη Equal ‘ΔΙ.ΚΑ.ΔΙ. – ROM’, ‘Μοίρα στα 199 των εκπαιδευτικών ανεγκών της Ελλάδας’ [Equal ‘ΔΙ.ΚΑ.ΔΙ. – ROM’ to 199 REPs in Greece], Ελευθεροτυπία [Free Press] (14/11/2006), http://archive.enet.gr/online/online_text/c=112,id=74065164 [accessed 9/2/2011].
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religion and origin country. The main characteristics of the specific minority that led to its social and professional exclusion are illiteracy, restricted communication, discrimination and lack of information and employment. Cultural differences have transformed into social contradictions that lead to conflict and rejection. Their divergence from Western ‘norms’ does not allow their integration, but leads instead to their marginalisation, isolation and ghettoisation. They live in the most denigrated areas, at the outskirts of cities, and many of them, such as the residents of Avliza, live in improvised constructions: tents or their minivans without proper electricity and water supply, in poor conditions of hygiene. The local societies are usually hostile towards them. Their presence is considered evidence of degradation, and people not only appear unwilling to integrate them into their life, but also attempt to persecute them. Incidents of discrimination, prohibition and persecution against the Roma occur daily in Greece.475

With the T.A.M.A. project, the artist opted for a more idealistic approach to the Roma community of Avliza, being attracted by the ‘haphazard layout, unexpected events, unplanned art works, strange people’. In her effort to shed light on the ‘hidden’ characteristics of the Roma and perhaps subvert the stereotypes that define their relationship to Greek society, Papadimitriou accentuated mainly the positive characteristics of the community and disregarded issues of major significance. The negative issues are not raised at any stage of the project, as I explain in the following sections.

1.3 The Network of Action

Papadimitriou’s first step was to engage friends and acquaintances, including art professionals (artists, curators, art historians and critics), architects, anthropologists, a journalist, a singer, a set designer, a clarinettist, a lawyer and even a dermatologist. All of the above were asked to share her interest in the community and contribute to the project in any way they could. Fifty-four contributors to the project, among whom thirteen were drawn from the Roma community, are recorded in the project’s catalogue published in 2002. Although

475 Most municipalities do not facilitate communication and contact with the Gypsies and keep them in extreme poverty conditions in order to force them to leave the municipality. Such action against Gypsies has taken place in the area of Menemeni in Thessaloniki in 1996, in Trikala in 1990 and 1997, in Aspropyrgos in 1999 etc. Almost in all cases, no alternative solution was suggested to the evicted after their expulsion. Whenever an alternative solution was proposed by the municipality authorities was either completely unsatisfactory, or, addresses a few Gypsies, mainly the few official residents. ‘Η κατάσταση των Τσιγγάνων στην Ελλάδα’ [The Condition of the Gypsies in Greece], Ελληνική Δημοκρατία. Εθνική Επιτροπή για τα Δικαιώματα του Ανθρώπου [Hellenic Republic. National Comission for Human Rights], 12, www.nchr.gr [accessed 28/4/2011].
some contributions are specific and defined, many other contributions remain unclear. There is, then, a question of whether it was the nature of a contribution as such that excluded the possibility of its record or whether other reasons made it impossible to record all contributions. The architects Dora Papadimitriou and Hariklia Hari designed an architectural project that focused on the creation of a movable network of infrastructure that would ‘add to the “quality of life” of the itinerant population of Avliza and be used for social, educational and cultural as well as recreational activities.’

Fabiana de Barros conceived and designed the Fiteiro Cultural/ Peripteron de Kultur [Kiosk of Culture], which was one of the few constructions materialised with the support of the Greek Ministry of Culture. De Barros considered the Kiosk of Culture as a social sculpture ‘proposed as a space provided to a community so that it can preserve, rediscover or re-create its cultural links; in other words, it is a shelter against oblivion’. Her intention was to create a space of utopia: ‘the utopia of a cultural site which would be a non-locus but would be defined in terms of the community in which it has been erected’.

---

Figure 4.1: Maria Papadimitriou, T.A.M.A., Peripteron de Kultur, 2000, Social Sculpture/Public Event/Workshop, Avliza (Athens).

478 Ibid.
The architects Andreas Angelidakis and Eleni Kostika offered a design for a playground. As they highlight in their text in the project catalogue, a field of play is open to exploration and dream, ‘for children who have lost everything except their childhood’. Yet, the fact that they traditionally get married and start families at a young age (especially women) is not indicative of such a carefree childhood. Other participants, namely the writer Sissi Tax, the anthropologist Maria Karamitsopoulou, the journalist Elisabetta Casalotti, the art critic Andrea Gilbert, the architects Zissis Kotionis and Caroline Raspè and the art historian and critic Denys Zacharopoulos published their essays in the catalogue in an attempt to provide a theoretical framework or record to express their personal thoughts about the Roma community. The artists DeAnna Maganias, Katerina Würthle, Sabine Hornig, Alexandros Psychoulis, Daniela Brahm, Apostolos Georgiou, Haralampi G. Oroschakoff, Spyros Papadopoulos and Thanasis Totsikas each offered a painting, drawing or photograph, also documented in the catalogue. Unavoidably, the specific contributions to the project raise the question of how such contributions might have been of help to the community. Although some of the contributors consider the project an offering (as further discussed below), it is difficult to understand how contributions such as the above benefit the community. It is more likely that paintings, drawings and photographs would facilitate the project’s circulation and consolidation within the art world rather than contribute to the betterment of the Romas’ lives.

1.4 The Project of Unrealised Art

When reading the catalogue of the project, published after the participation of T.A.M.A. in the 25th Biennale of São Paulo (2002), one gets the impression that the main aim and possible achievement of the project was the initiation and development of a communication network that would promote a continuous dialogue among the Roma, the art-world and other professionals. Yet, there are no explanations neither of the way this network was ‘constructed’, namely where and when the exchanges took place, nor of the ways the Roma were involved; there is just a great emphasis on establishing relations, without even specifying what kind of relations these were to be.

The architect and theorist Giorgos Tzirtzilakis discusses how the subtitle of the project, *Social Facilities for Itinerant Populations*, describes in a precise way what *T.A.M.A.* is about:

The starting point is the set of relationships which will develop, and the aim is not to produce ‘new images’ but to process the visual and empirical data of Avliza which concerns more people that the idle visitors of a gallery. What is really attempted here is a new system for artwork production. Today, everybody proclaims that in post-industrial societies production loses its prevalence to knowledge and communication becomes the prerogative of art. In this sense, *T.A.M.A.* promotes relationships rather than the picturesque aspect exalted by tradition lovers or the regime of sensational breaches exalted by modernity.\(^{480}\)

While the subtitle of the project stresses that it would provide social facilities to the Roma population, Tzirtzilakis sets the focus on the development of relation and communication networks as a new way of art production and outcome. It remains unclear, though, in what terms the proposed but unrealised social facilities, or the communication network, was beneficial for the specific (or any other) itinerant population so as to be considered ‘social facilities’. The creators of the architectural designs, Dora Papadimitriou and Hariklia Hari, also noted that ‘the first priority is to establish an infrastructure and activities that above all will cultivate relations (relational aesthetics)’.\(^{481}\) The emphasis is again clearly placed on the production of relations and not on the materialisation of the project, which would probably have been more beneficial for the Roma community. In fact, according to one other collaborator of the project, *T.A.M.A.* was completed at the level of a proposal since the realisation of the constructions would not add anything to *T.A.M.A.* as an art project; on the contrary, it would lead to the artist being ‘exploited’ by the Roma.\(^{482}\) That is an interesting point and a paradox; if the constructions were to be realised, this would have required funding either from the Ministry of Culture (as it happened with the ‘kiosk of culture’) or from patrons and not from the artist. In what way then would the artist be exploited by the Roma? On the contrary, one could suggest that the Roma might have been exploited for the sake of art since their gain was most likely just the ‘experience’ of participating in an art project (since even the building of friendship involved the artist and a specific family, not the


\(^{482}\) Fotiadi, 2011, 123.
whole community). Moreover, suggesting that the artist would be exploited displays a level of covert racism. Perhaps then what T.A.M.A. articulates best, even unintentionally, is the disclosure of how deep-seated stereotypes are.

Evidently, some collaborators’, or rather contributors’, approach to the project draws from Nicolas Bourriaud’s theory on relational aesthetics and the concept of the artwork as ‘social interstice’. According to Bourriaud, relational art takes ‘as its theoretical horizon the realm of human interactions and its social context, rather than the assertion of an independent and private symbolic space.’ Yet, it seems that the art production that T.A.M.A. fostered would fit better into the theoretical framework of Kester’s ‘dialogic art’, since it emphasises interaction and promotes conversation as a mode of action rather than the actualisation of relations beyond a discursive level. The mechanisms of action undertaken by the participants of the project imply genuine dialogue (but not much more) between the Roma community and the professionals across diverse disciplines who led the design (but not realisation) of infrastructure that would improve the Roma living conditions.

The issue of the potential realisation of the designed infrastructure is only mentioned by the art historian and critic Efi Strousa, who was a participant in and the curator of the project when it was presented at the São Paulo Biennale. Strousa notes in her essay in the catalogue that the aim of the artist was to contribute to the improvement of the living conditions of a neglected social group through the development of an action plan. She refers to the construction of the proposed infrastructure with the support of sponsors ranging from ‘individual enthusiasts to major forces in the art world’. Yet, in another text, Strousa is more accurate about both the specific intentions of the project and the people who would bring it to life:

The T.A.M.A. is the sum of the activities of Maria Papadimitriou in collaboration with her volunteer associates and the people of Avliza, aimed at designing and realising an infrastructure which would improve their standards of living. This resulted in designs for various spaces, open or indoor, such as modular homes, buildings for children’s creative activities, recreation and guest facilities, kiosks, etc., offered by the T.A.M.A. to the Roma community in a primary form and the inhabitants

484 See Kester, 2004.
themselves are left free to complete them according to their own aesthetics.  

She also noted that while Papadimitriou was working on the presentation of the project at the 25th São Paulo Biennale, a parallel effort was initiated to find sponsors. Optimistically, Strousa stressed that T.A.M.A. was gradually becoming a reality thanks to the positive response from cultural institutions and individuals from the art world. She mentioned specific art collectors and organisations—Alpha Bank, Prodromos Emfietzoglou (art collector), Anny Costopoulou (artist and art collector), Dakis Joannou (art collector) and Konstantinos Papageorgiou (art collector)—who had supposedly subscribed to the concept of T.A.M.A. and would offer the financial means for realising at least some of the project’s proposed structures.

Although Papadimitriou’s statement in the catalogue does not specify the project aims, when interviewed in 2014, Papadimitriou seemed decisive about her intent to help the community ameliorate their living conditions. She talked about the way she developed friendly relations with some of the Roma, and she expressed her anger and disappointment when she realised that they have been extremely isolated and not fairly treated by the state since they appear to have duties but almost no rights as Greek citizens. She then explained that she intended to use art as a ‘Trojan horse’ to enter the political system and assist the community in their fight for a better life. While T.A.M.A. was in progress, the European Union funded the Greek state to support the Roma and create appropriate infrastructures. Yet, according to the artist, only a small part of these subsidies reached the Roma because of corruption among state officials. Papadimitriou decided then that she wanted to act as an intermediary between them and the state in order to help them attain better conditions of everyday life and build the infrastructure needed, and the Roma agreed to collaborate. In the interviews, she does not explain what caused the project’s failure; she only mentions that the outcome was finally a pilot programme which was adopted by several departments of architecture in universities.

---


487 The Ministry of Culture had already undertaken the Kiosque à Culture (by Fabiana de Barros), which, according to Strousa, was warmly received by the community and had been taken over by the children who engaged in creative activities with Maria Papadimitriou. Efi Strousa, 25th Bienal De São Paulo, 23/03/2002. http://www.arch.uth.gr/en/activities/312 [accessed 20/6/2015].
abroad.  She also mentioned that she delivered a proposal for Avliza to the Ministry of Internal Affairs but did not receive any response. Papadimitriou has also explained that for a long time after her first visit to Avliza, she did not consider the personal relationships she developed with the people there as ‘art’. At first, she just wanted to help them by offering clothes and food, bringing her own doctors and helping the children with their lessons. Moreover, when she took certain friends and acquaintances with her, it was only to share her experiences with them and arouse their interest. Such a statement blurs even more one’s understanding of Papadimitriou’s intentions and the project’s aims. It remains unknown at what point she considered that personal help and development of friendly relations evolved into an art project.

Although it has not been openly admitted by the contributors, it seems that the project failed to achieve its main goal, if it was to ameliorate the living conditions of the Roma community in Avliza. Hence, what is important to consider about T.A.M.A. is not only the personal or social relations developed among a few residents and contributors, but also and foremost its obstruction of actualisation due to the lack of state support and sponsors. While there are numerous examples of artworks that intervene in the social fabric, T.A.M.A. testifies to art’s inability to transcend political obstacles and affect social practice. Such a blockage of realisation may be considered indicative of the obstacles to socially effective or useful art that transcends the boundaries of representation, symbolism or mere communication and penetrates the political realities of society and economy.

As mentioned before, in 1998, there was no contemporary art museum in Athens, despite the fact that Greece has a great number of museums and cultural sites (sixty-five archaeological museums, for instance). Contemporary art has always been given less importance compared

---

488 Papadimitriou, interview with Stamata Dimitrakopoulou, ‘Πέρασα Δυο Μέρες με την Μαρία Παπαδημητρίου που θα Εκπροσωπήσει την Ελλάδα στην 56η Μπιέναλε’ [I Spent Two Days with Maria Papadimitriou Who Is Going to Represent Greece in the 56th Biennale], October 2014, http://www.vice.com/gr/read/maria-papadimitriou-synenteyksi-eikastikos [accessed 30/6/2015] and interview of the artist by Katerina Zacharopoulou on the tv art programme Εποχή των Εικόνων [Era of Images], (27/08/2014), http://epoxhtwneikonwn.gr/post/95987129034/tama-superflow-%CE%BC%CE%B1%CF%81%CE%AF%CE%B1-%CF%80%CE%B1%CF%80%CE%B1%CE%B4%CE%87%CE%BC%CE%B7%CF%84%CF%81%CE%AF%CE%BF%CF%85 [accessed 30/6/2015].

489 Fotiadi, 2011, 225 (endnote 351). Papadimitriou also mentions in one of the interviews that she tried to contact the director of the department of ‘quality of life’ in the parliament to find out how she could act in relation to the Roma community but does not explain any further details. http://www.vice.com/gr/read/maria-papadimitriou-synenteyksi-eikastikos [accessed 30/6/2015].

490 Fotiadi, 2011, 121.
to the art of the Antiquity and Byzantium periods.\textsuperscript{491} The Greek state’s fixation on tradition and its ideology of ‘Greekness’ have contributed to the state’s side-lining of modern and contemporary art production for many years, as discussed in previous chapters. Lacking state support, contemporary art’s practices, exhibitions and discourses have been organised through individuals’ private initiative. As Eva Fotiadi has very accurately noted,

\begin{quote}
Under these circumstances neither the private bourgeois patrons, nor Greek society and political life ever came to regard artists so much as social actors, but, much more as national and ideological figures. Consequently, avant-garde practices, including social interventions by artists and any relevant discourses, were paid insufficient attention to, or were scantily recorded as such.\textsuperscript{492}
\end{quote}

The absence of state support and the political corruption that has characterised the Greek state for many decades now (such as the EU funding expropriation), provide pertinent reasons for Papadimitriou’s failure to successfully instrumentalise her role as an artist and intervene at a policy level—which is what the successful realisation of the project would have required. Although it remains unclear why the sponsors withdrew from their original commitments to financially support the project, the project’s realisation would have required the allocation of land by the state, an extremely complicated and lengthy procedure (of uncertain outcome) in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{491} Cornelius Castoriadis has characterised the situation as ‘the contemporary Greek drama’. The main constituents of this ‘drama’ are, on the one hand, the triple reference the Greek tradition encompasses, namely to the ancient Greeks, the Byzantium and the folk culture as produced and shaped the last centuries of Byzantium and the years of Turkish subjugation. On the other hand, it is the Greek’s psychopathological relationship with West European culture, which is even more thickened by the fact that Western culture is going through an intensive crisis and an underlying disintegration the last decades. Castoriadis goes on to explain that this dual and simultaneous reference to ancient Greece and Byzantium led and continues to lead to deadlock, first and foremost because the two traditions are totally incompatible. The ancient Greek culture is a culture of freedom and autonomy, expressed on political level through the state of free citizens who govern themselves collectively and on the spiritual level by incessant revolutionary renewal and search. The Byzantine culture is a culture of theocratic heteronomy, imperial authoritarianism and spiritual dogmatism. In Byzantium there are no citizens, but only subjects of the emperor. There are no thinkers, only commentators of the sacred texts. The combined effort and reconciliation could therefore only standstill every creative effort and lead to a sterile scholasticism, like the one characterizing the intellectual status quo of the country for almost half a century after the establishment of an independent state. Castoriadis Cornilios, ‘Οι Μύθοι της Παράδοσης μας’ [The Myths of our Tradition], \textit{Ελευθεροτυπία} [Free Press], 21/8/1994. It should be noted though that Castoriadis omits to discuss the patrarchal and autochthonic nature of the classical Athenian polis which excluded women, foreigners and slaves.
\item \textsuperscript{492} Fotiadi, 2011, 129. Fotiadi makes that observation not to address the issue of the project’s failure but to discuss the emergence of a young art scene in the early 1990s that was ‘increasingly vibrant, ambitious and oriented towards an international mainstream of art Biennials and magazines, and away from anything considered as outdated Greek-centered parochialism and inferiority complexes’. Papadimitriou and \textit{T.A.M.A}. were exemplary cases of that scene (p.130). In her approach to \textit{T.A.M.A}., Fotiadi sets the focus on the production and operation of relations as art.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
its own right. In the absence of planning and construction permission, the ‘social facilities’ would have had to have been provided illegally.

1.5 Activist Art versus Activist Intention

Fotiadi refers to T.A.M.A. as ‘an experimental collaboration between artists and architects with a social activist character’, and Papadimitriou herself defines her work as a form of activism:

I suppose that my art-making, which is about process and change rather than finished product, can be considered a form of activism. I view art production as a humanist endeavour, because I see art in humanity as well as something involving and affecting human lives. Activists scrutinize society and work to improve it. What’s more, the changes they manage to bring about on a local level set precedents that resonate beyond borders.  

Nonetheless, it seems that the unrealised part of the project places it closer to the sphere of an imaginary utopian space rather than a social activist one.

As Boris Groys has remarked, many current discussions about art centre on art activism as a new artistic practice that differs from critical art. It is worth quoting him at length:

Art activists do not want to merely criticise the art system or the general political and social conditions under which this system functions. Rather, they want to change these conditions by means of art—not so much inside the art system but outside it, in reality itself. Art activists try to change living conditions in economically underdeveloped areas, raise ecological concerns, offer access to culture and education for the populations of poor countries and regions, attract attention to the plight of illegal immigrants, improve the conditions of people working in art institutions, and so forth. In other words, art activists react to the increasing collapse of the modern social state and try to replace the social state and the NGOs that for different reasons cannot or will not fulfil their role. Art activists do want to

---

be useful, to change the world, to make the world a better place—but at the same time, they do not want to cease being artists.\footnote{494} Although Papadimitriou’s pursuits seem to be similar to social activist art that is also practically useful, there is an evident gap between intentions and outcome. Globally, a great number of art projects have related to dwelling and the living conditions of specific communities. One such project that has been successful is the \textit{Project Row Houses} initiated by Rick Lowe in 1993. \textit{Project Row Houses} is situated in a low-income, predominately African-American neighbourhood in Houston’s Northern Third Ward, which was about to have been demolished due to gentrification plans. The project began with the purchase of twenty-two row houses. With the help of students at Rice University’s School of Architecture and hundreds of volunteers, these houses were transformed into sites of local cultural participation, artist residencies and transitional homes for single mothers who would be provided with training, education and assistance for a one-to-two-year period. With funding from the National Endowment for the Arts, private foundations and a growing group of activists, \textit{Project Row Houses} has grown to forty houses and includes exhibition spaces, a multimedia performance art space, a literary centre, offices, low-income housing and other amenities.\footnote{495}

What \textit{T.A.M.A} and \textit{Row Houses} have in common is the display of the record of their existence in numerous art venues and exhibitions around the world and the artists’ wish to offer assistance and support to communities of the socially excluded. Conversely, what

\footnote{494} Boris Groys, ‘On Art Activism’, \textit{e-flux}, 2014 \url{http://www.e-flux.com/journal/on-art-activism/} [accessed 2/9/2015]. Gregory Sholette in his article ‘Merciless Aesthetic: Activist Art as the Return of Institutional Critique. A Response to Boris Groys’ argues that art activism is hardly a new phenomenon since it dates back to the 1790s referencing Jacques-Louis David’s elaborate public floats designed by the painter for public fêtes to rally support for the French Revolution and more recent examples such as the Art Workers’ Coalition, the Guerrilla Art Action Group (GAAG), Critical Art Ensemble, The Yes Men et al. \textit{Field, A Journal of Socially-Engaged Art Criticism}, issue 4 (Spring 2016), \url{http://field-journal.com/issue-4/merciless-aesthetic-activist-art-as-the-return-of-institutional-critique-a-response-to-boris-groys} [accessed 25/08/2016] It should be noted though that Groys refers to this new social art activism that engages usually specific communities and manifests itself through the creation of new structures and alternatives pertaining to people’s urgent needs such as housing, food and education.

differentiates the two long-term, community-engaged projects is the effect they had on the involved communities. Nevertheless, Lowe, as opposed to Papadimitriou, had considerable support. A number of political leaders with links to the city’s African American community were alarmed after having seen the displacement that took place as a result of gentrification in the Fourth Ward.  

Thus, although socially functional art reflects an urge to address tangible problems through do-it-yourself initiatives and through ‘a model of citizenship that does not really expect much from the state and representative democracy’, it becomes obvious (through the juxtaposition of the above examples) that political and state support can be a decisive factor in their realisation.

At this point, it is worth mentioning the T.A.M.A. project’s expansion into subprojects, one of which was T.A.M.A. House. This subsequent project encompassed the construction of a house for one of the Roma families in 2004–2005, after the project’s official end (2002). It was considered part of the greater project Mapping the Invisible: EU Roma Gypsies. Papadimitriou, with a group of Avliza’s residents, illegally built a house for Kyriakoula, her best friend in T.A.M.A., whose dream for the last 17 years has been to live in a real house. As the artist explains, ‘what I did was to make the dream come true. We occupied a piece of land and we started to build a house without any permission. Everything is illegal: the land, the house, and the construction workmen.’

---

496 Lowe found an ally in Texas State Representative Garnet Coleman, who ‘developed his own unorthodox approach to challenging gentrification’ by using TIF (tax increment financing) to buy up property for use as low-income rental housing. The project was therefore an essential component of a broader process of resistance. See Kester, 2011, 217-218.

497 Angela Dimitrakaki. 2011. ‘The Art Biennial as Symptom: The Exhibition Logic, Contemporary Art and Resistance beyond Rhetoric’, 88. Dimitrakaki, among others, in her analyses of the project emphasises the DIY initiative but does not refer to the political allies Lowe had on his side as crucial to bringing the project to life.

498 As stated in EU-Roma website about T.A.M.A., a number of activities were organised for the Roma community at Avliza after the official end of the project. The activities comprised 2 workshops per month (to play / to learn), educational programmes for children (2003—2004), professional training workshops, educational and recreation facilities for the local people and counselling service for the community (2003-2008). No further information was however available, http://www.eu-roma.net/dblog/coorganisers.asp [accessed 20/4/2014].

The issue of illegality once again confirms the discouraging stance of the state and the Ministry of Culture towards art that can address urgent needs of communities.\textsuperscript{500} Thus, the Roma were left with one ordinary (and illegal) house for one specific family that was closely connected to the artist, while the project’s architectural designs, produced after field research to address the Roma’s particular way of living, became a pilot project in university departments of architecture abroad. One could perhaps assume that such a gesture (building a house illegally) carried a symbolic value, implying a sort of revolutionary disobedience. However, I have to agree with Giorgos Tzirtzilakis, who believes that although the illegal housing constructed by communities that live in extreme poverty could be seen as a sort of distorted critique on capitalism, the construction of the illegal property in Avliza cannot be identified as a revolutionary act because the value system it supports takes for granted the existing world order.\textsuperscript{501} The construction of a house for the artist’s friend—instead of, for instance, a building for social interaction or any other common use—aligns with the culture of capitalism that fosters individualism and (re)produces inequality.

\textsuperscript{500} Illegal Structures (Aythaireta) has been a notorious urban and social problem in Greece for years.

\textsuperscript{501} Giorgos Tzirtzilakis, ‘Μαθαίνοντας από την Αύλιζα. Επισφάλεια, Κοινωνική Τοπογραφία και Συνεργατική Ελευθερία στην Εποχή του Μεταφορντισμού’, [Learning from Avilsa. Precariousness, Social Topography and Cooperative Liberty in the Age of Post-Fordism], \textit{Κριτική και Τέχνη [Criticism and Art]} (Athens, AICA Hellas), 05, 194.
Nevertheless, another issue is clearly raised here (but also in all projects that foreground the utilitarian dimension of artistic practice and intend social betterment through art): Why should the state subcontract artists to protect and promote the social and economic wellbeing of its citizens? In other words, why should the state ask artists to do its own job? Grant Kester, an advocate of such projects, argues that the role of the community artist can be productively compared with that of the reformer or social worker:

Both the community artist and the social worker possess a set of skills (bureaucratic, diagnostic, aesthetic/expressive, and so forth) and have access to public and private funding (through grant writing, official status, and institutional sponsorship) with the goal of bringing about some transformation in the condition of individuals who are presumed to be in need. 502

The question of whether or not the artist should function as a social worker is inextricably related to whether the artist’s role is to set an example or unsettle the example, question the given norms and escape the established understanding. Should art cover for the state’s inability to provide social services or should it provoke people’s discussion and revolutionary

---

creative rage?\textsuperscript{503} According to John Holloway, ‘It is from rage that thought is born, not from the pose of reason, not from the reasoned sitting back and reflecting on the mysteries of existence that is the conventional image of “the thinker”.\textsuperscript{504} In his book How to Change the World without Taking Power, Holloway theorises (perhaps even romanticises) the notion of the scream and underlines its power not as an act of horror and resignation but as an act of hope, as a dream of freedom, as a refusal to accept.

A refusal to accept that the spider will eat us, a refusal to accept that we shall be killed on the rocks, a refusal to accept the unacceptable. A refusal to accept the inevitability of increasing inequality, misery, exploitation and violence. A refusal to accept the truth of the untrue, a refusal to accept closure. Our scream is a refusal to wallow in being victims of oppression, a refusal to immerse ourselves in that ‘left-wing melancholy’ which is so characteristic of oppositional thought. … Our scream is a scream to break windows, a refusal to be contained, an overflowing, a going beyond the pale, beyond the bounds of polite society.\textsuperscript{505}

If art is a gesture or place of resistance, should it not convey such scream? And moreover, could this be attained through peace-making and affirmative strategies that exclude any form of provocation and exposure? It seems that in the late expressions of art, manipulation and participation, submission and resistance, obedience and dispute, subordination and freedom can constitute a blur and indefinable space of action. The art status has evidently extended to forms of sociability and communication, but the crucial issue is whether these forms pose or suppress the social question.

1.6 Participation in Question

If we consider that the Social Facilities for Itinerant Populations were not to be realised but to remain in the sphere of a symbolic ideal space, there still remains the question of whether the project promotes a democratic ideal. By advocating increased visibility and social

\textsuperscript{503} Claire Bishop has argued that art should not be valued for its ‘truthfulness and educational efficacy’ rather than for inviting the viewers to ‘confront darker, more painfully complicated considerations of our predicament’. 2006. ‘The Social Turn: Collaboration and its Discontents’, Artforum (February) (February), 44/6, 183.


\textsuperscript{505} Ibid., 3.
inclusion of the unheard voices of the Roma, who could embody the underrepresented and isolated identities of other minorities as well, what this project could actually stand for is the crucial participation of the Roma in the design of their own housing and the right therefore to choose their own way of living instead of being obliged to adjust their lives to whatever is offered to them. In other words, T.A.M.A. seems to support the idea that all citizens should participate in decisions made in regard to their lives. This could be achieved through their participation in a dialogic process, which has been deemed the core of some works of art discussed by Grant Kester. For Kester, ‘conversation becomes an integral part of the work itself’ and ‘is reframed as an active, generative process that can help us speak and imagine beyond the limits of fixed identities’ through the ‘intersubjective engagement’ that unfolds in such projects. In some of the projects Kester discusses, as for instance in Suzanne Lacy’s *The Roof Is on Fire* (1994), the non-participant viewers witness a dialogic process that takes place on the basis of dissensus rather than consensus. Lacy, along with Annice Jacoby and Chris Johnson, wished to subvert media stereotypes and the racial profiling of Oakland teenagers by bringing together 220 Latino and African American high school students and having them discuss family, violence, sexuality, drugs, neighbourhoods and the future, in 100 cars parked on a rooftop garage. On the contrary, in T.A.M.A., the dialogue is insinuated rather than presented to or experienced by an external audience; there is no reference to a public visiting the ‘museum’ in Avliza apart from the artist’s collaborators and the few of those conversations. Yet we are left to believe that conversations did take place despite the absence of evidence. Thus, what the viewers of the project’s record—it has been exhibited in diverse forms and within diverse contexts, as we see next—can see is partially the community’s living conditions and some everyday life moments (such as the Roma eating, dancing, singing, etc.) through an assortment of photographs and videos taken during the project. Notably, this visual evidence excludes any record of the Roma’s ideas and beliefs, at least in relation to the design and construction of the social facilities. The catalogue, in fact, documents the ideas of the artists and other professionals. Again, nowhere do we see a text on the Roma’s beliefs and ideas.

Some ‘backstage’ facts should also be considered. Fotiadi underlines that in conversations with individuals actively involved in T.A.M.A., she was told that the project was developed in collaboration with just one group, which sells furniture, is more welcoming than others and was not involved in illegal business like other groups presumably were. Yet, even with this

506 Kester, 2004, 8.
group, it was basically only the artist, and not all of the T.A.M.A.’s team, who could communicate intimately. Furthermore, in discussions with some contributors, Fotiadi was strongly discouraged from visiting Avliza (especially alone), since the community could be quite unwelcoming to strangers. Thus, while the inclusion of participants (both the Roma community and the contributors) was supposed to undermine the traditional role of the artist as individual creator, it seems that the artist’s authorship was not really challenged since it was she who decided not only who the participant subjects would be, but also the extent of their participation.

The issue of ‘controlled’ participation does have precedents. It was partly evident in Lacy’s *The Roof Is on Fire*. The participant teenagers explained in a documentary on the work that they did not like ‘the way they were being ordered’, and they felt like the adults involved in the production ‘were taking over’ and ‘did everything’ during the preparation. Lacy, in the same documentary, explained that while being open to ideas, she wants to have the final say and make the final decisions; she drew a parallel to herself as an artist painting a canvas, explaining that she wants to be, in the same way, in control of the placement of the cars and the way people will move into the space, but she does not interfere in what the teenagers will discuss and in the way they will present themselves. Thus, it seems that in both cases, when the artist and her ‘material’, namely the participants, have different perspectives, in the end it is the artist who prevails. This seems appropriate since it is the artist’s idea in the first place that is being actualised, yet it challenges the argument that the artist surrenders ‘the security of self-expression for the risk of intersubjective engagement’ that Kester discusses in relation to such collaborative projects.

The issue of authorship and self-expression also dovetails with the project’s subsequent circulation and display in numerous exhibitions around the world. Although T.A.M.A. was launched as a collaborative platform, the collaborators from the Roma community did not actually partake in its success. Avliza residents were invited to public presentations of T.A.M.A. such as the São Paulo press conference in Athens, but only one family showed up.

507 As Fotiadi explains ‘a justification was that the Roma used the spaces between their homes like their own living rooms and disliked strangers entering them. This explanation sounded like a contradiction to T.A.M.A.’s identity as a public art project.’ Fotiadi, 2011, 125. In addition, the only realised construction, the Peripitero de Cultur, was destroyed by locals who, according to Papadimitriou, wanted the wood for heating. Ibid., 123.

508 See the documentary *The Roof in on Fire* by Craig Franklin, [https://vimeo.com/39865636](https://vimeo.com/39865636) [accessed 2/9/2015].

509 Kester, 2004, 8.
Then, only Yorghos Mangas, who played the clarinet for the video T.A.M.A. *Sentimental* and who is not a resident of Avliza, though a Roma, travelled to São Paulo with the artist.510

1.7 Exhibiting T.A.M.A. and Expanding Its Meaning

T.A.M.A. has been successfully presented, as art documentation entailing elements of installation, in several international exhibitions in different contexts and versions. Diverse forms of documentation, such as photographs, videos and installations composed of makeshift dwellings, pieces of furniture and everyday objects, were used as to represent the process that took place in Avliza all those years. In 2001, part of the project was presented in the 1st Tirana Biennale titled *Escape* before the more extensive version was presented in São Paulo in 2002. The title of the São Paulo Biennale was *Metropolitan Iconographies*, and its themes were the contemporary metropolis and the conception of utopia.511 The same year, T.A.M.A. represented Greece in *Manifesta 4* in Frankfurt, where Papadimitriou set up an installation of white plastic garden chairs, which the Roma use frequently, a fake Persian carpet and oriental brass band music coming from loudspeakers.512 T.A.M.A. was also presented in the exhibitions *In Search of Balkania* in Graz (2002), *Going Public: Politics, Subjects and Places* in Modena (2003) and *Gorges of the Balkans* in Kassel (2003). In 2002, just after the project’s international success, Papadimitriou was awarded the DESTE prize, by a non-profit private art institution based in Athens, for her entire oeuvre.513 It is clear that T.A.M.A. has been a ‘successful’ art project, though it failed to accomplish its main goal to realise a proposed infrastructure plan.

A few years later, in 2009, T.A.M.A. participated in the 10th Biennale of Lyon as part of a broader EU–Roma project.514 The biennale theme and title was *The Spectacle of the

513 The DESTE Foundation for Contemporary Art is a non-profit institution based in Athens. The DESTE Prize was established in 1999 and is awarded every two years to a Greek artist living in Greece or abroad. ‘The Prize aims to showcase the work of a new and emerging generation of artists and it is an integral part of the Foundation’s policy for supporting and promoting contemporary art in Greece.’ For further information see their website: http://www.deste.gr [accessed 4/4/2010].
514 The EU-Roma project was born as an attempt to map the Roma people across Europe (From London to Greece passing through France, Italy and the most remote villages in Romania), within a geographical, cultural and social frame. For more information look at the book *Mapping the Invisible EU-ROMA Gypsies*, (Black Dog
Everyday, aiming at ‘changing fundamentally both the spectacle and the everyday’ as the best way to ‘confront the current crisis the whole world is entangled with’. According to Hou Hanru, the curator of the biennale, ‘It’s here, in such an engagement, that contemporary art and culture can regain their social role as a critical force and a channel for imaginative propositions for a better future.’ Hence, T.A.M.A. partook in the Lyon Biennale as a project intending to subvert ‘the spectacle’ and function as a critical force that can bring social change. The Roma remained a source of inspiration for the artist, who has continued to use pieces of the project and develop new approaches to the subject matter (namely the Roma) for several more exhibitions in Greece and elsewhere until now. For example, in 2014, she presented her work Brand Gypsy Globales at the Benaki Museum in Athens, participating in the Deste Fashion Collection, an ongoing project conceived by the DESTE Foundation examining the crossovers between art and fashion.

In São Paulo and Frankfurt, authorship of the project was attributed to Maria Papadimitriou (with the art curator and critic Efi Strousa credited as the project’s curator). At the Biennale of Lyon, the artist was presented as a member of a collective, created in 1998 by herself, the artist Lucy Orta and the curator Gabi Scardi. Specifically, the collective invited the following artists to collaborate: Alessandro Quaranta, Phoebe Giannisi, Pavel Braila, Želimir Žilnik, Paola di Bello, Sıtkı Kösemen, Enzo Umbaca, UNLAB (Andreas Faoro, Francesca Rizzetto) and Ioan Florin Tala. As stated on the website of the biennale:

For years now artists Lucy Orta and Maria Papadimitriou and exhibition curator Gabi Scardi have been studying the situation of the Roms in Europe. This collective work is being carried through in parallel with an

---


interdisciplinary project financed by the European Union and involving four countries: Italy, the UK, Greece and Romania. While the Roms—or Gypsies—are recognised as an ethnic entity by the EU, they remain the focus of the most enduring prejudices and stereotyping. For the members of the Temporary Autonomous Museum for All, the Roms in all their diversity represent the paradigm of those who aspire to autonomy without abandoning their right to a voice in the public arena: ‘If we consider habitat as the mirror of those who live in it’, says Maria Papadimitriou, ‘the habitats of the Roms are the mirror of the world we live in.’

*T.A.M.A.* became part of a greater project related to the Roma called *European Roma Mapping*, funded by the European Union. The Europe-wide three-year research project was conducted by EU-ROMA, a coalition of architects, designers and artists who collaborated with Gypsy communities in Romania, Greece, Italy and the UK. EU-ROMA wished to raise awareness of the diversity of the Roma people and to propose a set of infrastructures adapted to their needs and ways of living. The project culminated in the publication of the book *Mapping the Invisible: EU Roma-Gypsies*. Again, the emphasis was on an open dialogue about public space and the housing issues of the Roma; the participants were professionals drawn from various fields besides art and architecture, such as the humanities, sociology, urban planning and human rights.

Evidently, *T.A.M.A.* was able to fit in several diverse contexts and adjust its meaning and intentions. *T.A.M.A.* was not only an open-ended, research-based, process-oriented project, but also one that generated a great number of subprojects through the years. This fact, on one hand, rendered its identity unstable, and on the other, contributed to its international success. Claire Bishop believes that this type of art production—the ‘work in progress’ type—seems to derive from ‘a creative misreading of poststructuralist theory’; this is to say that it is not the interpretations of the artwork that are being open to constant reassessment, but the work of art itself. In *T.A.M.A.*, though, both the artwork itself and its meaning or interpretation are in a continuous state of flux, adjusting themselves in both form and meaning to a variety of themes and discourses. *T.A.M.A.*, along with other projects of similar expansion logic, follows the growth and diversification imperative in a capitalist economy. As Angela

---


Dimitrakaki has noted, referring to the work of Turkish collective Oda Projesi, in order to be considered successful, a project has to produce other projects; this way, the artists increase their ‘personal capital’ through the accumulation of projects which renders them more attractive to agents regulating the opportunities of income-making in the art world.\footnote{Dimitrakaki, 2013, 231. See also Sebastian Budgen. 2000. ‘A New “Spirit of Capitalism”’, \textit{New Left Review}, 1, 153.}

1.8 Blurring the Boundaries between Failure and Success

In summary, the project succeeded in setting up a creative network among professionals of different disciplines and raising their concern about the problematic social exclusion and extreme lack of facilities the Roma face. The outcome of such collaboration was the innovative design of alternative infrastructure facilities which, however, remained a design that has been used by schools of architecture rather the Roma community.

Moreover, the project failed to expose major problems around the Roma community. No reference is made to the drug trade, the high level of violence and crime, the reasons that led to the distrust of and discrimination against this community or the ramifications of such social exclusion (besides the lack of proper housing facilities). In addition, the mistreatment of women within their community but also within their broader societies (specifically, their forced sterilisations) are again dismissed. Maria Karamitsopoulou’s essay ‘The Power of Women in a Male-defined Society’, included in the project’s catalogue, provides the only reference to women’s lack of power, privileges or rights in the Roma communities.\footnote{Specifically, Karamitsopoulou writes ‘Women appear as marketable commodities; the bridegroom’s family “buys” the bride for a sum between two and five million drachmas in the form of dowry’. Maria Karamitsopoulou. 2004 [2002]. ‘The Power of Women in a Male-defined Society’ in Papadimitriou (ed.), 2004, 94.}

However, her text does not accentuate women’s deprivation of rights, but emphasises rather their ability to allegedly overcome such problems.

The project also failed to subvert the existing stereotypes about the Roma through the deconstruction and reconstruction of their ‘invisible’ identities. Strousa argues that the artist managed to avoid the classic failing of observers, ethnographers and sociologists who ‘develop an objective vision which inevitably keeps them at a distance and leads them to form an idealised image of reality’.\footnote{Papadimitriou, 2004, 20.} Therefore, according to Strousa, the artist managed to transcend the boundaries and limits of observation, escaping and subverting a utopian
representation of the Other. The exotic Other has been explored by artists for several years now, yet the need to define new parameters in the discussions and representations of otherness remains. In the case of *T.A.M.A.*, and in contradiction to what Strousa claims, not only did the project not destabilise the notion and representation of the Other, but it is also questionable whether it broke away from representation as ‘spectacle’.  

Of course, no artist is meant to save the world or the Roma community, but the fact that *T.A.M.A.* was presented as an ‘offering’, implies that it was intended to be beneficial for the community. The word ‘tama’ in Greek (as discussed in Chapter 2) means ‘offering’, and it is clear that some of the contributors to the project considered the project as an offering. For instance, Strousa writes: ‘Thus the *T.A.M.A.* (in the sense of vow in Greek) standing as a gesture of “offering”, “gratitude” or “promise”, either precedes or follows the “miracle”. In this case, the miracle invoked by Maria Papadimitriou has been taking place all the time in the last four years, as the interactions between the artist’s idea and the different ways it is received, interpreted and variously added to by heterogeneous sensibilities and attitudes trigger a chain of transmutations.’ The notion of offering alludes inevitably to generosity, which has taken different shapes in Western art practices since the 1990s—as a free commodity or service. However, the concept of art as a free service was never commonplace in Greece. Despite the well-intentioned connotations that generosity has, it also carries problematic ones, since it depends on uneven power relations between parties, as in the case of *T.A.M.A.* As Mary Jane Jacobs notes, ‘Charged with giving, the receiver—their audiences—is seen as being in need, lacking or deficient’. The case here is even more problematic since the artist’s intentions to give ‘voice’ to the Roma and generously improve their everyday life were not fulfilled.

In fact, now, so many years after the beginning of the project, the living conditions in Avliza have worsened not only for the Roma community, but also for the rest of the residents.

---

523 As Fotiadi argues, ‘their [the Roma’s] position and role in the process of making *T.A.M.A.* seems to have been gradually moving from being close to and co-presenting with the author-subject, to becoming represented. In the end, and despite whatever intentions the artist might have had, their image as a culturally exotic and socially marginalized “Other” seems essentially not to have been challenged but preserved’, Fotiadi, 2011, 131.


525 Pavlos (Dionysopoulos)’s performance in Hydra in 1974 in which he polished the shoes of his friends and passers-by, wearing tailcoat and white gloves, is an example of very few performative practices where the artist offers her/his services to the audience. The performance is described in Adamopoulou, 2000, 60.


527 Several newspaper articles and websites bring up the problematic situation in Avliza regarding the ghettoisation and criminality in the area.
the project’s communication network had involved the rest of Avliza’s inhabitants—who are said to be in constant dispute with the Roma—instead of or in addition to the art professionals, the project would have perhaps fostered a more constructive and democratic, if also discomforting, dialogue.

*T.A.M.A.* is presented by the artist and some of its contributors as a project that supposedly attained an ideal collaboration between the Roma and the art world since no conflict or feeling of discomfort was expressed by either side. It was only some years later that Papadimitriou admitted that ‘at some point in our time with the Roma there were conflicts because your [our] interest in them can easily turn into unreasonable expectations or be misunderstood by them’.528 Creating conflicts was certainly not the artist’s intention, and their disclosure undermines her earlier claim of an ideal collaboration. The issue of confrontation as a constituent element of democracy is further discussed in the analysis of the next project.

2. Egnatia Road: A Path of Displaced Memories

2.1 *The Project*

Another long-term collaborative project, part of which was realised in Greece, was *Egnatia Road: A Path of Displaced Memories* (2002–2005), a co-operation between European artists, architects, designers, theoreticians, writers and local populations along the ancient route Via Egnatia that was built to connect Rome and Constantinople, the Western and Eastern capitals of the divided Roman Empire. The route passes through Southern Italy and across the Otranto Canal through Albania, Macedonia and Tracie. The road has been the route during the dramatic displacement of millions of Albanians, Armenians, Bulgarians, Greeks, Jews, Slavs, Turks, Kurds, Roma, Sinti and other minority groups, refugees and immigrants moving from their homeland toward Western Europe.529

---


529 Giorgos Agelopoulos, ‘Τα Μακεδονικά Περάσματα της Εγνατίας’ [Macedonian Paths in Egnatia] in *Διασχίζοντας την Εγνατία, Ένας Αδελφικός Οδηγός* [Along the Egnatia, a Fraternal Guide], 34-35. For more information see also the project’s website: [http://www.osservatorionomade.net/egnatia/](http://www.osservatorionomade.net/egnatia/) [accessed 20 October 2015].
The project was co-funded by the European Commission programme Culture 2000 and initiated by Stalker/Osservatorio Nomade, a research network based in Rome, in collaboration with Oxymoron, a non-profit cultural organisation in Athens, and Atelier d’Architecture Autogérée (AAA) of Paris, a collective that engages with participatory urban actions. *Egnatia Road* began as a study of the Balkans, their history, storytelling and traditions and resulted in the creation of mobile and temporary workshops and events evolving around a range of peoples. The ongoing intention was to bring together stories of displaced peoples (‘stateless refugees’ or ‘illegal immigrants’) and produce paving stones that would symbolically record the personal and communal experiences of people along the road. The location for the placement of the personalised paving stones were chosen by each storyteller or the community at large. 530

The project’s research and production were developed simultaneously in a range of places by different groups of people. The main research and post-production sites were in Rome, Athens, Paris and Berlin, but at the same time, general meetings for workshops and research were held along the Egnatia Road in Otranto (Italy), Tirana (Albania) and Thessaloniki (Greece) among other places. 531

The project required the participation of specific communities and individuals, once again unrelated to the art world, and was organised and produced by a collective in co-operation with a number of art professionals. In the description of the project, buzzwords such as ‘interactions’, ‘network’ and ‘displacement’ attest to similar interests, methodologies and (to some extent) intentions as T.A.M.A. The project derived originally from interdisciplinary research, and its main focus was interaction and the formation of a network among immigrants and refugees and artists, researchers and art theorists. Some of the participants were Matteo Fraterno, Davide Barletti, Giorgio D’Ambrosio, Simone and Nikola Uzunovski,

530 For example, as Marina Fokidis, the curator of the sub-project developed in Greece, explains, a Kurdish refugee who had left Lavrio detention camp, outside Athens, and was passing from Italy to Germany was the first to talk about the Lavrio camp to the artists from the group and asked for his stone to be left there. Later, the research group discovered the camp, placed his stone at the site, and set in motion a new research area that remained active for a long time, leading to other stories. Marina Fokidis. 2007. ‘Hijacking Cultural Policies; Art as a Healthy Virus within Social Strategies of Resistance’, *Social Analysis*, 51/1: 58–67, 64. The article is also included in Judith Kapferer (ed.). 2008. *The State and the Arts: Articulating Power and Subversion* (Berghahn Book): 42-51.

531 Ibid., 64.
Roberto Greco, Laurent Malone, Michalis Kyriazis, Mary Zygouri, Raffaella Aprile, Antongiulio Galeandro and Silvia Biagi.\(^{532}\)

On the project’s website, the collective states that the project aims ‘to promote European cultural diversity’, ‘encourage intercultural dialogue with migrants and minority groups’, ‘facilitate a common ground where to encounter and share values and cultural experiences’ and ‘re-construct the cultural unity of the fragmented and disputed entity of the Egnatia’.\(^{533}\)

Once again, emphasis is placed on cultural diversity, participation of minority groups, intercultural dialogue and sharing experiences.

### 2.2 Within the Greek Borders

In 2005, three subprojects of *Egnatia Road* were organised in different places in Greece. One of them took place in Thessaloniki under the title *Ghost Bustering*. It comprised an encounter between the artists and specific historical places involving immigrants and refugees, such as monuments, museums and markets.\(^{534}\) A conference was also organised in Thessaloniki involving scholars, architects and artists who research displaced people, with a special focus on Egnatia Road. The conference also featured the film *Lavrio Crossing* and a public talk about Lavrio Centre from members of the Athens Agency. The second project was a travelogue starting from Greek-speaking places in south Italy and going to Istanbul. A film called *Radio Egnatia* was produced, and a booklet/guide was published.\(^{535}\) The third project was conceived and realised by the Greek artist collective Savra and took place in Lavrio near Athens, and on the island of Makronisos. This last project involved political refugees of multiple nationalities (Afghans, Iraqis and others) living in Lavrio.\(^{536}\)


\(^{533}\) Osservatorionomade Website, [http://www.osservatorionomade.net/egnatia/sito%20egnatia/info.html](http://www.osservatorionomade.net/egnatia/sito%20egnatia/info.html) [accessed 2/5/2011].

\(^{534}\) Osservatorionomade Website, [http://www.osservatorionomade.net/egnatia/sito%20egnatia/athina_calendar.html](http://www.osservatorionomade.net/egnatia/sito%20egnatia/athina_calendar.html) [accessed 2/5/2011].

\(^{535}\) Information about the project was given to the author by Mary Zygouri.

\(^{536}\) The group Savra consists of Nikos Tranos, Thodoris Chryssikos, Liambeys Leonidas, Kotsanou, Marina Lykiardopoulou, Kostantis Skatzis, Tzimoulis.
The collective’s methodology—similar to T.A.M.A.’s—consisted of frequent visits to the Lavrio Refugee Centre (every two weeks) by the group in order to comprehend the dynamics of the space, develop relations with the residents and introduce the aims of the project. During the visits, the group spent time with the residents, engaging in discussions on personal, social and historical issues. As the artist Nikos Tranos (member of Savra) notes, it was not only the Kurds that narrated their histories, but the Greek team as well. Two-way communication was the only way to gain the Kurds’ trust, develop friendships and convince some of them to participate in the project. It was even harder to convince them to participate in the excursion to Makronisos since there were conflicts among the different groups and leaders. Some of the events organised in Lavrio included screenings of Kurdish films and workshops engaging children with games and fun activities (such as measuring the perimeter of the Lavrio Centre in footsteps). An all-day picnic with some inhabitants of the Lavrio Centre was also organised at the Sounio National Park near Lavrio.

The final part of project, the excursion to Makronisos, was intended to create communication and collaboration through the exchange of stories between the refugees in Lavrio and the art team. The trip was also organised as a closure event with symbolic meaning. The island of Makronisos, just opposite Lavrio’s harbour, has a conceptually charged significance because of its political history. The island, throughout the years, has been a camp for Turkish prisoners in the Balkan Wars (1912–1913), a reception and organisation centre for refugees from Asia Minor (1923), a concentration camp for the ‘national reformation’ of leftist dissidents during and after the Civil War (1947–1952) and a prison for exiles during the military Junta (1967–1973). Today Makronisos is deserted, haunted by the torture and cruelty that has taken place. The trip to this specific island was inspired by Walter Benjamin’s *Theses on the Philosophy of History*, where he underlines the importance of acknowledging...
the barbarism and violence that has been a part of history. Tranos notes that it was important for the Greek group not only to learn about the Kurds’ history, but also to confront the fascist past of Greece.

1.3 Agonistic versus Communiative Spaces

Before describing the Makronisos trip, it would be useful to discuss an incident that occurred just before the participants boarded the boats. The incident is reported and discussed by cultural theorist Nikos Papastergiadis—himself a participant—who highlights a disagreement between the artist Jacopo Gallipo and the unnamed leader of Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK: Partiya Karkerên Kurdistanê) exiled in Greece that occurred during their exchange on cultural politics. Gallipo was talking about fluid as opposed to ‘stabilised’ identities and hybrid as opposed to essentialist cultural values, advocating for and explaining the importance of imaginary homelands in contrast to territorial ones. The leader of PKK disagreed, emphasising the interrelation of culture and nation and contending that there can be no culture without national space. The two men could not, ultimately, establish a common path. The curator of the project on the Greek part, Marina Fokidis, left the room and the PKK leader quit the conversation. At this point, Papastergiadis notes, Fokidis had just achieved her goal though not having identified it. Considering the political disagreement described above, and despite the fact that Fokidis in her article on the project does not mention confrontation as a project aim (rather, she underlines the value of collaboration), Papastergiadis refers at least implicitly to the production of an ‘agonistic space’, as defined by political theorist Chantal Mouffe, as the core outcome of the project. Mouffe’s widely discussed thesis suggests an agonistic model of democratic politics that objects to any form of consensus and instead aligns with an agonistic conception of democracy that ‘acknowledges the contingent character of the hegemonic politico-economic articulations which determine the specific configuration of a society at a given moment’. In the course of the argument between Gallipo and the PKK leader, a consensus was not reached at any level, either by ‘an exchange of arguments constrained by logical rules’ (Habermas) or ‘through persuasion’

544 Nikos Tranos, interview with the author (18/11/2016).
545 Papastergiadis, 68-69.
547 Ibid., 3.
What was achieved was the experimental and non-prescribed production of an agonistic space as a ‘battleground where different hegemonic projects are confronted, without any possibility of final reconciliation’.

Mouffe’s position reflects a broader tendency whereby democracy is seen as a group’s or individual’s right to disagree. And yet, despite the specific isolated instant of disagreement, what both Egnatia and T.A.M.A. seem to foster is not, in effect, antagonism (at least not entirely), but communication, agreement, rapport and friendship through dialogues, since the matter of conflict is concealed more than accentuated. In her article *Hijacking Cultural Policies: Art as a Healthy Virus within Social Strategies of Resistance* (2007), Fokidis herself stresses the importance of artistic collaboration, not only as an alternative means of art production, but as the substance of the project and ‘the only strategy to address the complex social and political issues that artists confront in this part of the world’.

In her own words, ‘what is most importantly learned from this operation is that the real work must “emerge” in the collaborative process… The process of working together is the project’. Tranos has also asserted that the confrontation he records was an isolated incident in the project. The project is therefore structured more as a communicative rather than an agonistic space.

Could this contradiction between dialogue as consensus and antagonism as dissensus developed in political theory and adopted in art theory be overcome if we accept a different conception of dialogue than that of Jürgen Habermas -who suggests that we have a rational consensus reached through dialogue which has to lead to mutual understanding if no factors are distorting the communicative action- that will offer a third option where dialogical communicational processes may lead to ‘better understanding but not necessarily to consensus’?

While Claire Bishop has used Mouffe’s perspective to underline the significance of the production of agonistic spaces in art practices (in contrast to consensual practices), Grant Kester has drawn on Habermas’s model of human interaction and advocacy of ‘discursive communication’ to outline his concept of ‘dialogical aesthetics’. Yet, according to philosopher Leszek Koczanowicz, antagonism and consensus are not inevitably
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contradictory, but can be treated as complementary, while dialogue in democracy can transcend both antagonistic and consensual perspectives. As Koczanowicz suggests, Mikhail Bakhtin’s idea of dialogue can be useful to the construction of a non-consensual notion of democracy. Democracy then can be seen as ‘a complicated set of conversations that do not necessarily lead to a consensus but could promote better understanding between all participants in the political struggle’.

Both the *Egnatia* and *T.A.M.A.* projects wish to address the idea of I-for-the-other (though they do not always succeed) through the endorsement of the other, omitting, however, to also approach the inevitable confrontation between I and the other, with the exception of the specific incident between the artist and the PKK leader. Bakhtin describes the mutual relationships between I and other as a set of passages from one to another. For him, dialogue is a combination of different voices, each having its own form and content without being assimilated. At the same time, he suggests that all voice is the reorganisation of other voices in a constant process of assimilation: ‘The ideological becoming of a human being, in this view, is the process of selectively assimilating the words of others’. As Koczanowicz notes, we perceive an event from our own perspective, and, while we can adopt the perspective of the other and enhance our own, the two consciousnesses never fuse. An individual, despite being a unique entity, cannot exist in separation from the other, and ‘both moments of this existential situation of the human being are constitutive for dialogue’. The necessity of communication with the other for the construction of our own identity implies an inevitably dialogical nature of the self. This idea is evident throughout Bakhtin’s work: ‘A person has no integral sovereign territory, he is wholly and always on the boundary; looking inside himself, he looks into the eyes of another or with the eyes of another’. Dialogical communication is a kind of social relation, and social relations encompass a contradiction. On the one hand, they are subordinated to various social norms, and on the other, they are an immediate and direct encounter between individuals. According to Bakhtin, these two characteristics of the social ‘confront each other’, and this tension has ‘consequences for social theory as language falls in the first category whereas dialogue is an embodiment of the
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second one’. The dialogical relation, even though it contains antagonistic tension, cannot be reduced to it. As Bakhtin explains, ‘Agreement is very rich in varieties and shadows. Two utterances that are identical in all respects... if they are really two utterances belonging to different voices and not one, are linked by dialogic relations of agreement’. Yet, a number of theorists, including Chantal Mouffe, Ernesto Laclau and Jacques Rancière, have indicated ‘antagonism’ or ‘dissensus’ as the very essence of the political and of democracy. Not exactly in contrast, but supplementary to the ideas of antagonism and dissensus, Bakhtin’s concept of dialogue can also be useful in grasping the complex ways of coming to understand. Understanding is also constituent of democracy since democracy cannot be defined by conflict exclusively, but includes communication as well. Thus, Bakhtin’s concept of dialogue underscores that dialogue is weak if it avoids conflict. However, it also shows that understanding, which is a strong value of the art projects discussed, is not a flat, one-level process, but it involves the relationships between various levels of the social that influence each other. Understanding achieved at one level can be contradicted at another level, which is what makes democracy such a complicated enterprise. For democracy, thus, what is most important is creating the conditions that would facilitate dialogue at all levels without the hope for arriving at ultimate understanding. From this perspective, understanding, not consensus, is a point of convergence of different contradictory powers that makes up democratic society.

As Koczanowicz maintains, Bakhtin’s ideas portray society as a place of endless dialogue between the utterances (texts) of different social groups. Bakhtin’s concept of dialogue contributes thus to the development of a new path in political theory that claims that the opposition between antagonism and dialogue can be overcome, at least under certain social conditions. This can happen because ‘dialogue is inscribed in all social relations and even more it is a basis for the constitution of the self’.

Dialogue and the plurality of voices is what the projects discussed in this chapter wish to advance and endorse. Yet in failing to acknowledge and perhaps stress the antagonistic and
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conflictive dimension of dialogue, they fall into the trap of political correctness, dismissing the fact that democracy is about both agreement and disagreement. Listening cannot only serve consensus but dissensus as well, as long as it does not necessarily connote and lead to agreement.

To return to the trip to Makronisos, around one hundred people participated in the day excursion, including the Lavrio Centre inhabitants, Savra group and other participants in the project. Upon arrival at Makronisos, Tranos again explained to the attendees the purpose of the trip. The art team and the refugees spent a full day together engaging in symbolic actions, having lunch, wandering around and exchanging stories. As Tranos explains, the aim was that the refugees and the artists would collaborate to remove the stones from the ground so as to render it cultivable; this way, collective labour would be in a symbolic sense productive, in contrast to the forced labour used to torture the political exiles.\(^{563}\)

The refugees were convinced to partake in this symbolic, yet physical action, for the sake of the art project. For the artists, this kind of material labour represented the spirit of collaboration and coexistence. In a way, working together symbolised their effort to address the other, to make each other feel welcome. And yet what could this action symbolise for the refugees themselves? Given that the living conditions in Lavrio, as in all refugee centres, are unacceptable, the buildings are dilapidated and the residents’ lives are in danger, why would they agree to clear the ground and make fertile a land owned by the Greek state, which has been unwelcoming and condemned them to a permanent ‘state of exception’, reducing them to ‘bare life’?\(^{564}\)
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\(^{563}\) Nikos Tranos, Interview with the author (18/11/2016). At the same time, according to the project’s website, two paving stones of the Egnatia transnational monument were placed there. One had been painted by the refugees for the occasion and the other by Giorgos Hatzimihalis, an old man and resident of Lavrio who, as a Leftist dissident, had been imprisoned in Makronisos. See Osservatorionomade website. [http://www.osservatorionomade.net/egnatia/sito%20egnatia/athina_calendar.html](http://www.osservatorionomade.net/egnatia/sito%20egnatia/athina_calendar.html) [accessed 2/5/2011].

\(^{564}\) See for instance Thaneia Vezou and Eleutheria Psychogiou. 2015. ‘Μια Κυριακή στο Λαύριο με τους Κούρδους Πρόσφυγες’ [A Sunday in Lavrio with the Kurds Refugees], Το Περιοδικό για τη Διατάραξη της Κοινής Ησυχίας [The Magazine for Disturbing the Peace], [http://www.toperiodiko.gr/%CE%BC%CE%B9%CE%B1-%CE%BA%CF%85%CF%81%CE%B9%CE%B1%CE%BA%CE%AE-%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF-%CE%BB%CE%B1%CF%8D%CF%81%CE%B9%CE%BF-%CE%BC%CE%B5-%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%85%CF%82-%CE%BA%CE%BF%CF%8D%CF%81%CE%B4%CE%BF%CF%85/#.WVF0FGiGPIU](http://www.toperiodiko.gr/%CE%BC%CE%B9%CE%B1-%CE%BA%CF%85%CF%81%CE%B9%CE%B1%CE%BA%CE%AE-%CF%83%CF%84%CE%BF-%CE%BB%CE%B1%CF%8D%CF%81%CE%B9%CE%BF-%CE%BC%CE%B5-%CF%84%CE%BF%CF%85%CF%82-%CE%BA%CE%BF%CF%8D%CF%81%CE%B4%CE%BF%CF%85/#.WVF0FGiGPIU) [accessed 20/4/2017].
The allegorical but also futile act of gathering the stones into piles resembles Francis Alÿs’s famous delegated performance When Faith Moves Mountains (2002) realised on the outskirts of Lima, Peru. The location is important in this case as well, as it was said to reflect the reality of Latin America, mirroring continual invasions and urban expansion. In this case, the performance concept was to move a sand dune a few centimetres through the effort of 500 volunteers, most of whom were students. The event was documented and a video of fifteen minutes was produced. In Alÿs’s piece, however, in contrast to the action on Makronisos, the artist summoned participants in this Sisyphean task not as collaborators, but rather as workers, ‘as bodies to illustrate a “social allegory” about the inevitable failure of Latin America to modernise successfully’. Yet, in both cases this symbolic and yet pointless act of manual labour ‘is seen to celebrate an abstract human spirit and its ability to act sacrificially so as to achieve something immaterial: namely, to renew faith in the

community by temporarily suspending the bitter reality of poverty, unemployment, conflict, and displacement’ tormenting a South American region in the case of Alÿs and the displaced population of Kurds refugees in the case of Savra. Manual work holds a particular significance for both projects. It is revealing of the fact that despite the assumed hegemony of immaterial labour in globalisation, manual work is associated with the poor (many of whom live in the Southern Hemisphere) and ‘is indeed peripheralised’, as Dimitrakaki explains. It is also associated with the displaced subjects that are condemned to material labour (if they have the chance to work). Refugees and immigrants, seen as cheap sources of labour, are sometimes welcomed (in specific numbers) in order to fill in the need for material labour, as in Germany where manual labour jobs and apprenticeships do not appeal to many young native Germans. Most of the times are though are unwanted despite the positive contribution of the significant manual labour they offer, as in the case of Greece. Thus, we have the racialisation of material labour. It is well known that today’s global capitalist system is structured and maintained within a worldwide system of white supremacy. Workers are located within a racialised and hierarchical labour system that exploits workers according to their race and gender. White/European workers are in general more privileged than workers of colour, who are deprived of basic citizenship rights and who face inferior working conditions and greater exploitation.

There is, however, a major difference between the two projects, which is further discussed in the next section. While in both cases the events were professionally documented, the spectacularisation of manual work ‘and through it of an irreducible material quality of labour’ in When Faith Moves Mountains ‘is perfectly compatible with the celebration of this piece by

568 For the case of GermanySee for instance Markus Dettmer, Carolin Katschak and Georg Ruppert. 2015. ‘German Companies See Refugees as Opportunity’, Spiegel (27 August), http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/refugees-are-an-opportunity-for-the-german-economy-a-1050102.html [accessed 15/4/2017]. A significant number of studies manifest/denote the particularly significant role and positive contribution of migrants to the agricultural, livestock farming and wider economic development of the Greek rural area. Immigrants have provided an extremely flexible and inexpensive workforce in the Greek economy without having replaced indigenous workers, as they are usually accused of. Most of the working population of migrants provide their labour as unskilled workers or craftsmen, mainly in manual work placements. About 1/3 of migrant workers are engaged in the construction sector, while there is also significant presence of migrant workforce in private households, which engage almost exclusively women, manufacturing Industry and craft industries, trade, hotels and restaurants. See Theo Mitrakos. 2013. Η Συμβολή των Μεταναστών στην Ελληνική Οικονομία: Μετα-ανάξανθη των Εμπερικών Ευρημάτων [The Contribution of Migrants to the Greek Economy: A Meta-analysis of Empirical Findings], Κοινωνική Συνοχή και Ανάπτυξη [Social Cohesion and Development], 8/2: 87-106.
a museum culture existing in competition over leisure time with the mass media’, as Dimitrakaki has aptly noted.\textsuperscript{570} Moreover, ‘in both those representational spaces momentous historical changes are archived as “images” practically at the moment of their occurrence’.\textsuperscript{571} On the other hand, the still and moving images (including a video of nine minutes) of the event on Makronisos have not (so far) been circulated either in exhibition spaces or on the internet. The event has, for the time being, remained in the participants’ memory and the artist’s archive as a document.\textsuperscript{572}

1.4 Resistance and Audiences

As Dimitrakaki notes, the whole project resisted the dominant exhibition logic since, despite the production of adequate documentation, it has never been exhibited as a whole (so far).\textsuperscript{573} Although the Savra artists expressed their wish to exhibit the documentation produced in Lavrio and Makronisos, it would be difficult for the entire project to be displayed. The rejection or impossibility of the project’s potential exhibition, has as a consequence the rejection of a non-participant audience or, possibly, public. The distinction between different publics in relation to access to art has been raised by art historians focused on contemporary art. Dan Karlholm underlines the distinction between two publics in participatory art: the primary and the secondary.\textsuperscript{574} The primary public comprises a group of people usually unfamiliar with art practices, who are involved in various ways as participants in artistic projects. In \textit{T.A.M.A.}, the primary public was the community of the Roma, and in \textit{Egnatia Road} it was the Kurds, immigrants and refugees in Lavrio and along the Egnatia Road. Such groups play a crucial role in the process and outcome of the projects since they constitute the artist’s ‘basic material’. They are therefore, as Karlholm notes, ‘treated with respect’ and are encouraged to ‘express themselves’, at least until the end of the project.\textsuperscript{575} But what happens afterwards? According to Karlholm, these publics ‘become actor-puppets in a play with a script unknown to them. They become fetish objects of the desired real world’.\textsuperscript{576} The integration of these people into artistic projects, instead of eliminating, actually underlines the

\textsuperscript{571} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{572} The video was sent to me by Tranos after our discussion on the project.
\textsuperscript{573} Dimitrakaki, 2013, \textit{Τέχνη και Παγκοσμιοποίηση}, 234.
\textsuperscript{575} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{576} Ibid.
distance between the primary public on the one side and the artists and the secondary public on the other. ‘The friendly socializing, low-tech environment, and air of “democracy” serve, arguably, to conceal this radical difference in terms of power/knowledge’. Yet, one this ‘radical difference’ might, instead of being concealed, actually be exposed, foregrounding issues of inequality.

While the focus in such projects is set on collaboration, the power, influence and contribution of the primary public cannot be considered equal to the artists’ since the participants work under rules and in frameworks defined by the artists. Discussions among art theorists and critics on the issue of the ethics in terms of the discernible exploitation of publics have been far from uncommon in recent years. Yet, most such discussions focus on artworks that convey discomfort and awkwardness to both the participants and the spectators or ‘secondary’ public. Such projects are either praised for exposing the hidden conditions underlying a social issue (for example, global wealth) or are denounced for amplifying and reproducing the worst kind of exploitation in an opportunistic pursuit of a successful artistic career. The possible manipulation of individuals or communities is disregarded when the artistic projects are veiled by notions of activism and social engagement. In other words, and to return to the projects examined in this chapter, the question is whether or not the artist or collectives manipulate and, in effect, control their primary publics for the sake of a proposed and sometimes unrealised democratic ideal that would prompt social change. It seems that between the artists or collectives and the participating communities, the former are always the qualified experts who indeed make the decisions; not everyone’s opinions are, therefore, of the same significance and value. Arguably, the only way a participant can disagree with the artist’s idea and (stated or unstated) intention is by refusing or withdrawing her or his participation in the project. Therefore, the possibility of achieving equal participation and distribution of power remains, at best, a question rather than being a temporary radical intervention in the hierarchies organising social life. Moreover, in terms of political economy, the notions of collaboration and co-production are hollow since the artists are, more often

577 Ibid.
578 The work of Artur Žmijewski, Santiago Siera, Thomas Hirschhorn, Renzo Martens and others, marked by sensations of unease and discomfort, constitute characteristic examples of such criticism.
than not, the only holders of the artwork’s copyrights.580 A further issue is whether what appears as ‘manipulation’ is an outcome of structural features of the artwork as it has been known: authorship, mastery and control over the ‘materials’ and various other features of the modern artwork.

On the other hand, it is worth stressing that the experience of participation (including even withdrawal from participation) might in fact be interesting or someway rewarding for participant communities. In the case of Lavrio, for instance, the refugees were happy to participate in the project since, as they admitted, they felt like ‘normal people’ being treated as equal human beings.581 The same is the case for the next project examined in this chapter, whose participants were eager to be involved. Could this mean that Karlholm’s conviction that there is no alternative for these publics but to become ‘actor-puppets’ and ‘fetish objects’ could be undermined? Should we not acknowledge the possibility for primary audiences to think and act critically, despite their disempowered subject position? In other words, to consider the participants’ manipulation as given in all cases is also to reinforce their weakness and inability to be critical; namely, it is to presume that these subjects are by default naïve, conforming, inconsistent and therefore easily manipulated, and this is again problematic. Although lack of critical thinking is a fundamental human problem, one has to allow the possibility for critical audiences and participants to exist outside the institution without necessarily being a bourgeois subject. Otherwise, the actions of hierarchical powers against the lower classes and the poor are reinforced and sustained. Moreover, the primary public is in fact what provides the artistic event ‘with a political, social and affective dimension’ through its effort and investment, as Bojana Kunst notes.582 This kind of effort—social, linguistic, affective—interweaves with an exchange of power that ‘opens the door for the audience into a temporary public space’ and ‘produces the added value of the event’.583 The primary audience works thereby with its social, cognitive and emotional skills—all central to contemporary forms of post-Fordist production.584 The primary public has thereby

580 See Panos Kobatsiaris. 2013. ‘Η Κριτική των Θεσμών ως Αμοιβαίος Μετασχηματισμός: Occupy Art, Ακτιβισμός και Κρίση’ [Institutional Critique as Mutual Transformation: Occupy Art, Activism and Crisis], Κριτική+Τέχνη [Critique+Art], 05, 73.
581 Nikos Tranos, Interview with the author (18/11/2016).
582 Bojana Kunst. 2015. Artist at Work: Proximity of Art and Capitalism (Zero Books), 62. Although Kunst refers to museum publics that participate in performative artistic events, her observations are also relevant to projects as the ones examined in this chapter.
583 Ibid., 61.
584 Ibid.
the power to either turn the project under construction into a social event (even under the rules of the artist) or not.

To return to the issue of diverse publics, the secondary public consists of the people—most commonly art professionals and art lovers—who turn up at exhibitions to witness some action, event or situation or to view and interpret displayed documents. However, there is also a third or ‘hidden/invisible’ audience which Karlholm does not differentiate from the secondary public. That is the public who see, watch and read fragmentary documentation of such projects in publications or on the internet. Lately in Greece, some project catalogues, such as that for *Human Trace* which is examined next, are accompanied by DVDs that show the visual documentation through photographs and videos. Hence, there is an unacknowledged public that comes into contact with an artwork completely cut off from any site specificity or exhibition environment. Often the documentation of long-term, process-based art projects, such as the ones discussed in this chapter, is what we might call ‘labour-intensive’ as regards the recipient. Going through such documentation demands many hours from the viewer and presupposes commitment and effort. Thus, although such projects might be easier to ‘interpret’, in contrast to the modern artwork that demanded the mediation of the expert, the hours needed possibly undermine the art-as-leisure perception and shift not only participation but also art viewing towards a hybrid place of education and work. Making art, especially performative art, is still not always recognised as ‘real’ work (as discussed in the next chapter); artistic work is therefore often portrayed as fun, pleasure-oriented or vocational, but not as labour. Likewise, art viewing has never been considered work, despite the mental and cognitive labour it demands. Generally, both the production and consumption of art are ‘seen as the antithesis of work; it is what we do when we are not at work’. Yet recent research has made apparent that it is not only art-as-leisure that is undermined, but the notion of leisure in general. In his book *The Labour of Leisure*, Chris Rojek demonstrates how leisure has become a form of labour since it is inextricably linked to both emotional labour and intelligence; the empathy for others, socially acceptable values and correct forms of self-presentation required from modern men and women in non-work activities with their friends, children, parents, etc., turn leisure inevitably into labour. It could be argued that

not only participatory audiences actually *work* for the artwork, but secondary and third audiences as well.

The *Egnatia Road* project refuses a secondary audience by rejecting the exhibition logic, but invites a third audience since, in addition to the concise catalogue-guide *Along the Egnatia*, which is indicative rather than representative of the project, there is information and visual documentation on the project’s website (which, however, is not particularly user-friendly and at times chaotic). According to Karlholm, secondary publics are even more essential than primary publics to such forms of art, given that without their consent and approval there would be no processes as art. However, ‘their role as part of the everyday processes of the art world, is not acknowledged openly, which is hard not to interpret as unreflective, hypocritical or even cynical’. The importance of reaching a secondary audience for such projects has also been advocated by Bishop, who believes that such art should address ‘both its immediate participants and subsequent audiences’ and needs ‘to be successful within both art and the social field, but ideally also testing and revising the criteria we apply to both domains’. On the other hand, Dimitrakaki offers a more radical perspective on the issue—which nonetheless borders on the utopian. As she explains, art’s autonomy enters the cycles of capitalist production in the exhibition where audiences experience art through the process of display in a manner which ‘imposes an identification of experience with the consumption of what is on display’. It is evident that all art practices, even those realised outside the exhibition site, succumb to the exhibition logic through art documentation. Yet, even when art is ‘executed in the field of “actual” social relations’, presented live and undocumented, it will still be tamed and yield to the dominant exhibition logic through specific mechanisms. Dimitrakaki gives as example Thomas Hirschhorn’s *Bataille Monument* (2002), presented in Documenta 11, which she argues became, possibly despite artistic/curatorial intentions, a site ‘where the local immigrant community was put on display for the privileged art tourists’.

Thus, in global capital ‘the avant-garde’s wish for “art as life” can be realised—but often as a dystopia enabled by capital as a social relation’. The exhibition appears thereby ‘primarily capable of reducing an art based on active relations between human beings into consumable
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Dimitrakaki’s reasoning leads to the conclusion that the exhibition logic is unavoidably connected to representation and that participation is structurally subordinated to the latter. The exhibition logic is not exclusive to art, but stems rather from the key role of consumption in capitalist economy. It is connected to the capitalist market since ‘commodities get exhibited and anything that can be exhibited can be a commodity’. She suggests therefore, that resistance could be actualised if contemporary art escaped the exhibition logic, though such a transformation of the art scene would be virtually unimaginable since it would require,

a momentous transformation of power structures, job profiles, art-school education and comfortable positions of consumption (the art community that consumes on its weekend visit to the latest show of ‘political art’ or the progressive collector who is prepared to acquire images of labour procured by artists)... any such effort would generate tidal waves of opposition.

In other words, Dimitrakaki seems to argue in favour of an art as resistance that would not only sustain its immaterial and ephemeral status, eternally resisting the exhibition and commodification of its documentation (or even documentation itself), but that would also be revealed to and experienced by primary audiences exclusively. Although the two projects already discussed entirely (Egnatia Road) or partly (T.A.M.A.) support art produced first and foremost for primary audiences, the next case study introduces, and possibly justifies, a different approach and perspective in relation to audiences. Human Trace was produced primarily for a secondary audience with the participation of a primary one, and its third audience has the chance to experience the project through the explicitly descriptive and rich photographic catalogue.

3. Human Trace

Human Trace was initiated by the artist Marios Spiliopoulos and presented in two parts. In 2008, the artist created a monumental installation at the former Charilaos–Kanellopoulos Olive Press and Soap Works factory in Eleusina, a working-class town in the vicinity of
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Athens, for the Aeschyleian Festival (1 September to 12 October 2008). The next year, the artist participated in the second Thessaloniki Biennale with the second part of Human Trace, produced and displayed in Thessaloniki. In both cases, the final installations unfold around memory, history, presence and the archive, and were made possible by the collaboration of many people outside the art world: many of the residents in Eleusina (including current immigrants and residents from the Asia Minor Refugee Association) and the artist’s acquaintances in Thessaloniki. Spiliopoulos’s intention was ‘to connect the city’s past with its present through people and their monuments and memories’. In other words, the artist prioritised the creation of spaces for the articulation of shared experiences and narratives. Hence, the installations were the outcomes of long-lasting performative processes between the artist and the residents of Eleusina and Thessaloniki.

3.1 Eleusina: The Performative Process, or, Challenging the Roles of Artist and Viewer

The first part of the project was realised with the participation of residents of Eleusina, a town about 18 kilometres northwest from the centre of Athens known for having been one of the most important religious centres of ancient Greece, the Eleusinian Mysteries, and the first industrial centre of the modern Greek state. Every year, during the Aeschyleian Festival, the abandoned soap factory (a space of approximately 17,000 square metres) turns into a site of art and culture. In Spiliopoulos’s case, it was transformed into a ‘factory of memory production’.

Eleusina was an agricultural village and port until 1872, when its first factory was established. Many more factories followed, and the village was transformed into an industrial centre, which provided employment not only to the local population but also to many of the refugees who arrived in Greece after the Asia Minor Catastrophe in 1922.


The olive press and soap work factory resulted from a partnership between the brothers Lysandros and Emmanouil Harilaos and the then all powerful commercial firm of Rallis. In 1892 Epameinondas Harilaos formed a partnership the chemist Nikolas Kanellopoulos and bought out the ‘Harilaos and Rallis’ company, continuing its business under the name of ‘Harilaos and Kanellopoulos’.
However, the concentration of so many industries in the town had disastrous consequences for the environment and the population’s health.\textsuperscript{600}

Spiliopoulos spent over two years visiting Eleusina, conducting archival research on its history, contacting its inhabitants and developing relations with them. In contrast to the previous projects examined in this chapter, in this case the development of relations and collaboration between the artist and the participants were not intended as the artwork per se, but as a method of art production intended to inform the artist. According to the artist, ‘the only way to give life to the factory was by engaging people in the project’.\textsuperscript{601} The residents’ personal narrations and objects led to a monumental installation across ten different sites, that would excite the interest of the residents of Eleusina, who were, at the same time, co-producers of the work.\textsuperscript{602}

The Eleusinians participated in the project in various ways by offering personal items, helping with the production of audio-visual material and amplifying the artist’s understanding of the history of the factory, place and people. The residents’ willingness to engage in the project and contribute however they could was also indicated by their positive response to the artist’s call for used shoes to be incorporated into the installation. Four thousand shoes were placed on the ground around the factory area, creating a path for viewers, leading them to eighteen different installations set to function as ‘memory traps’. The Eleusinians also actively participated in the final shaping of the work. For instance, Spiliopoulos had set up some old, plain beds in one of the installations, and the residents of Eleusina spontaneously added bedding and clothes, and even nailed an icon on the wall, noting that ‘that’s how it was back then’.\textsuperscript{603}

According to the artist, one of the most significant aspects of this work was the trust he developed with the residents. He stressed that he had never met any of them before, which contrasted with his project in Thessaloniki which had only involved people he already knew.\textsuperscript{604} Trust was apparently followed by a sense of intimacy that allowed the Eleusina residents to share, initially with him and later on with hundreds of viewers, personal stories of

\textsuperscript{600} For more information see Efthymios Lazongas and Vassias Tsokopoulos. 2010. ‘Historical Framework’, \textit{Marios Spiliopoulos: Human Trace}, 45-63.

\textsuperscript{601} Information on the project was given to the author by the artist Marios Spiliopoulos. Interview [6/9/2009].

\textsuperscript{602} Spiliopoulos in an interview with the author emphasised his wish to make an artwork with and for the residents of Eleusina, (6/9/2009).


\textsuperscript{604} Spiliopoulos, Interview with the author (6/9/2009).
their life. A great number of video narrations were produced and integrated in the installation, shedding light on diverse features of Eleusina’s history and present.


During the production period, Spiliopoulos also visited the primary schools of Eleusina to introduce the project to teachers and students. His intention was to involve the children in the project and connect them with the history of the place by giving them the opportunity to discover the factory by themselves. He spent many hours with them discussing the complex history of Eleusina and the factory to convince them to participate in the project, a fact which again implies that relations require time and trust building to develop.605 Both teachers and students partook in the artistic process through performances directed by the artist, recorded and projected as part of the installation. Specifically, the music instructor created a choir with some of the participant children and sang the Greek song ‘Koimisou Persefoni’ and another one, ‘Eleusina Thea’, composed by one of the teachers.
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3.2 The Installation: ‘A Factory of Memory Production’

At the gate of the soap factory a lighted sign was placed—resembling stylistically an old factory sign—inscribed with a sentence in ancient Greek ‘Όλβιος ὁστὶς τῆς ιστορίας ἐσχεν μάθησιν’, meaning ‘Blissful is she or he who has learned history’—highlighting the importance of historical knowledge. The first installation was set at the factory’s headquarters: a light and sound installation—telephone ringing, typewriters clacking and workers discussing—along with a reproduction of the old logo of the factory, simulated working conditions. The next room was full of army beds, used clothes and objects, brought and placed there by women, members of the Asia Minor Refugee Association. In addition, two large photographs (3 by 4 metres) were used; one of the refugees upon their arrival in Eleusina and the other portraying them as workers in the factory. The room referenced the conditions experienced by the refugees who were relocated in Greece after the Treaty of Lausanne and the population exchange between Greece and Turkey in 1922. The factories provided them with water, accommodation and work placements. Photographs demonstrate that the refugees were exhausted and starving upon their arrival.

Figure 4.9: Marios Spiliopoulos, Human Trace, 2008, Installation, Eleusina.

The press release of the exhibition begins with the question ‘Can the abandoned factories become factories of memory production?’
In another room, a video showed four women singing songs about displaced people, while rectangular machinery bases were transformed into lit tombs. Another video exposed the difficult living conditions of current immigrants by showing them waiting in queues to receive a visa or searching for work. Indeed, viewers constantly came across juxtapositions of the past and the present. In the next building, the windows were covered with four photographs of students participating in the project, along with a photograph of the sculpture of the ‘little mystic’ of Eleusinian Mysteries from the Museum of Eleusina. In another environment, a video showed water running from a tap, as a symbol of catharsis and perhaps an allusion to the refugees’ lack of water.

Other installations consisted of a great number of photographs: for example, a large photograph of the factory workers holding a banner celebrating May 1rst, footage of mass agitations and protests during the years of Eleusina’s industrialisation, forty photographs of the now aged workers and another five of the archaeological excavation conducted by Charles Lenormant. All the pictures came from archival research.

In parallel, five tubular constructions were transformed into offering altars where the artist deposited the basic elements of the Eleusinian ritual. A recorded testimony by Mrs Eleni, a woman that worked at the factory for fifteen years as a chemist’s assistant and secretary, filled the space with narrations about the war, the process of making soap and local
Eleusinian customs. Further on was an open square where one could hear a voice pronouncing names of the workers. Mr Stelios Iordanou, a former worker, told his stories about his life and work at the factory. Another room was devoted to the former local football team, Paneleusiniakos, including photographs and interviews of the players. Finally, a room offered watch films and documentaries about Eleusina and its history.


Such an account of the monumental installation aims at both transmitting some sense of the intensely charged atmosphere of the space and illustrating the variety of means used by the artist to immerse the viewers in an aesthetic and audiovisual experience with the potential to provoke emotional and intellectual stimulation as well. Personal narratives of the hardships people experience, along with photographic material, sounds and objects charged with memory, is more likely to provoke emotional reaction than a juxtaposition of plain historical facts. On the other hand, the idea of recreating history by bringing together historical material from archival data and oral histories can raise questions on the socio-cultural dimensions of memory, the construction of history and historical value and meaning. In this work, a different way of organising the material was in order, focused on the archive and its development.

607 Syrago Tsiara notes in the exhibition catalogue: ‘And since “memory doesn’t connect intellectually but emotionally with the past”, according to the historian Antonis Liakos, the installation of Marios Spiliopoulos contains and generally diffuses the emotional burden of human beings, through stories which allow us to recapture a relationship with the past as experience by those who lived it’. Syrago Tsiara.2010. ‘Document of Emotion’. *Marios Spiliopoulos: Human Trace*, 241.
In addition, I also wish to point out the different approaches of the three artists and collectives discussed in this chapter regarding the display and what Miwon Kwon has called the ‘unhinging’ of their site-specific projects. In T.A.M.A., Papadimitriou extracted bits and pieces of her original project and adapted them to various exhibition themes and formats, producing a number of diverse installations exhibited around the world. On the contrary, in the case of Egnatia Road project leftovers in the form of documentation appeared only on the project’s website, where few images and long texts are available, and in the limited-edition catalogue which (as mentioned earlier) was indicative rather than exhaustive; display was thereby defied. Finally, in the case of Spiliopoulos’ Human Trace, site specificity dictated the terms of inclusion: the exhibition site was itself the place of history to be discovered and unearthed, and this is what initiated the project in the first place. Documentation was thus produced to be displayed exclusively in one specific site. Later, numerous photographs, a few videos and texts appeared on the artist’s website and in the project’s catalogue, addressing a third audience.

Kwon, critically examining the problems and contradictions surrounding site-specific and site-oriented art, notes that the art work has become more and more ‘unhinged’ from the actuality of the site—‘unhinged both in a literal sense of physical separation of the art work from the location of its initial installation, and in a metaphorical sense as performed in the discursive mobilisation of the site in emergent forms of site-oriented art’. 608 While the immobility of site-specific art challenged commodification in the past, site specificity now seems to adopt mobility and nomadism for the same reason. However, as Kwon observes, ‘The nomadic principle also defines capital and power in our times’. 609 She suggests then that this unhinging of site specificity and adoption of nomadism might not be ‘a form of resistance to the ideological establishment of art’, but rather ‘a capitulation to the logic of capitalist expansion’. In other words, she suggests that artists are working in the same way the capitalist system is, despite their intentions to object to it. Yet, apart from T.A.M.A., which is a typical example of site-specific art’s unhinging in that it was re-curated over and over again, the other two projects have resisted (so far) their dislocation and therefore de-contextualisation and alteration of locational meanings. They have challenged or perhaps even defied the pressures of museum culture and the art market and rejected Susan Hapgood’s

608 Miwon Kwon. 1997. ‘One Place after Another: Notes on Site Specificity’, October, 80 (Spring), 96.
609 Ibid.
observation that ‘the once-popular term site-specific’ has come to mean ‘movable under the right circumstances’.610

3.3 Thessaloniki: Ways of Seeing History

In 2009, the artist, in the framework of the second Biennale of Thessaloniki, worked on an analogous project on the history of Thessaloniki. This time the project was not in any way based on archival research. It instead presented a more subjective view of history through a series of videos showing his friends and acquaintances talking about Thessaloniki as the city they live in.

The main part of the installation was in one of the biennale exhibition spaces at the port. Additionally, a neon sign in ancient Greek, again with the same phrase ‘Όλβος όστις της ιστορίας έσχεν μάθησιν’ was placed at Plateia Eleftherias (Freedom Square). The artist chose this specific location because of its historic significance. It had been named Freedom Square to commemorate one of the first acts of the Young Turk Revolution in 1908; much later, in July of 1942, under the Nazi occupation, the Jewish men of Thessaloniki were ordered to assemble there. Once they were in the square they were forced to do calisthenics, beaten and humiliated. In March of 1943, the Germans began deporting the Jewish inhabitants of Thessaloniki to the Auschwitz death camp.611

The installation space was divided into three rooms. In the first one, a number of videos featuring people of diverse ethnic, religious and social origins and different ages and psychological moods were streaming continuously and simultaneously on separate displays. A matrix projected on a wall included each streaming video, along with pictures of Marios Spiliopoulos’s friends. In the second room, the viewer would encounter personal items and photos together with a streaming video of Sophia Ieremiadou, an elderly woman from Asia Minor and the grandmother of one of the artist’s friends. In the video Mrs Ieremiadou narrated stories of her life, chatted with her grandson, made coffee and sang. In the third room, one could watch a filmed performance by a well-known music group from Thessaloniki, Mora sti Fotia (Babies on Fire), who satirised a classic Greek patriotic song

611 For the history of the city see, Christos Zafiris. 2007. Η Μνήμη της Πόλης. Η Θεσσαλονίκη του 19ο και του 20ο Αιώνα [Memory of the City. Thessaloniki in 19th and 20th Century] (Athens, Gnosis).
about Thessaloniki by performing it in an alternative, punk version. The installation continued outside the building where four photographs depicted four monuments of the city: the Armenian one, the Hebrew one, the Grigoris Lambrakis monument and the Pontic one. Each photograph was accompanied by a recording of corresponding traditional songs.\footnote{Until the outbreak of World War One, around five million Pontic Greeks and Armenians lived throughout the territories that constitute modern-day Turkey. By 1923, two and a half million had been massacred, with the rest fleeing for their lives to Greece and the then USSR, or converting to Islam. The Hebrew monument refers to the Jewish Holocaust of 1939 to 1945. Grigoris Lambrakis, a leftist member of the Greek Parliament, was killed on May 22, 1963 by two far-right extremists, shortly after he had delivered the keynote speech at an anti-war meeting in Thessaloniki.}

The centre piece of the work was the space with the videos. Spiliopoulos’s project provided a range of independent personal narratives related to either Thessaloniki or the artist himself. The viewers saw a number of videos streaming simultaneously and had to use earphones. Viewers would have to spend hours if they wished to watch every narrative since the total duration of the videos was over eleven hours. A Jewish community leader, an Armenian resident, a Thessaloniki chef, an excited Pontiac, a romantic Turk, a keeper of a saloon soon to be closed, the next generation of soccer fans, friends in costume performing traditional folk music, a number of artists and many other independent personal narratives would map out a subjective perception of Thessaloniki’s history in an attempt to fill gaps in the city’s official history and challenge the very meaning of history. The artist himself appeared in a few different videos: playing football with some of PAOK’s (one of the city’s football teams) players, walking with friends from White Tower to the project’s site and engaging in a \textit{bras de fer} with the right wing former prefect governor of Thessaloniki, Panayiotis Psomiadis, in a confrontation between politics and art—in which politics won, as the artist commented.\footnote{Psomiadis was the only participant that was not friends with the artist. The politician had a particularly popular profile on the Greek political scene with a high percentage of votes in the 2000s. He has been criticised for political populism and has been accused many times of being royalist and supporter of the Junta during the time he was a MP. He has been accused of misappropriating public money and of being involved in several political scandals. See for instance \url{http://www.tovima.gr/politics/article/?aid=352826} and \url{http://www.ethnos.gr/politiki/arthis/kaiei_kyberhisi_kaia_maxsimou_epistoli_psomiadi_gia_batopedi-1830765/} [both accessed 12/3/2017].}
3.3 Rethinking and Redefining History: Intersections of Archives and Cultural Memory through Oral History

In Eleusina the main ‘stops’ along the reconstructed audio-visual journey were the Eleusinian Mysteries, the arrival of the Asia Minor refugees, the contemporary immigrant and the industrial workers’ history. The children’s participation reflected not the leverage of memories, but the construction of new ones. The compilation of real oral testimonies—workers’ narrations about their working and living conditions, recent immigrants’ accounts of their ‘legalisation’ procedures and struggles to survive, refugees’ songs—attempted to not just supplement extant archival material, but recreate multiple versions of collective and personal memory and therefore redefine, within a highly specific social context, the content and purpose of history.

The partly archive-based history of Eleusina exists in contrast to the profoundly subjective, personal narrative-based articulation of Thessaloniki’s history. The installation in Thessaloniki included a great number of personal accounts—seventy-five, to be exact—but we cannot test their accuracy or compliance with historical facts. The narrations follow no coherent chronology or other form of order. The Thessaloniki residents are speaking in different contexts and times, without any direct reference to each other’s accounts. Tragedies from forced migrations and genocides co-exist with personal tragedies and stories without any hierarchical order. Although Human Trace, in both of its parts, is not about history in conventional terms, each personal narrative is a contribution to the viewer’s conception of Eleusina or Thessaloniki retrospectively. It is structured through the frameworks provided by the participants, from children to the elderly, taxi driver to philosopher, Asia Minor refugee to Pakistani immigrant and so on. The diversity of identities and subject matter leads to a rather multi-layered approach to the past and present.614 What Spiliopoulos suggests through this project is the subversion of the normative structures of history. What he achieves is an alternative construction and not mere representation of the history of the two places, based foremost on the personal and sometimes trivial events of the residents’ lives in addition to the ‘great’ and ‘memorable’ events that have taken place. The use of social structures as explanatory forces is not new; it has been promoted by the Annales School of history since 1929 in France, and numerous artists around the world take the same approach. The work is therefore representative of a major tendency in contemporary art.

614 See Paul Thomson. 2000. [1978]. The Voice of the Past: Oral History (Oxford University Press) where the writer analyses the way oral histories can contribute to a more realistic construction of the past.
The artist’s interest in using archives but also in creating new oral ones could, in fact, reflect the general growing interest in oral histories focused on subjects and not events, manifested by museums, schools and archives in the last two decades or so in Greece. The use of oral history, especially in museums, was firstly publicly discussed in the national conference _Can Oral History Make Objects Speak?_ in Nafplio in 2005 by the International Council of Museums (ICOM), and in 2012 the newly launched Greek Oral History Association organised the Oral History National Conference _Bridging the Generations: Interdisciplinarity and Narratives of Life in the 21st Century: Oral History and Other Bio-histories_ at the University of Thessaly. The turn to oral histories has been embraced more recently by Greek art museums and archives. For instance, the National Museum of Contemporary Art in Athens created an archive of oral interviews with contemporary artists (conducted by art professionals) with the aim to contribute to a new reading and reconstruction of Greek art histories. The Contemporary Greek Art Institute (ISET) has also included in its archive hundreds of interviews with Greek artists conducted by the artist Katerina Zacharopoulou during the years of her TV programme _Η Εποχή των Εικόνων_ [The Era of Images] (ongoing since 2003).

Since ‘reality is complex and many-sided’, as the sociologist and oral historian Paul Thomson argues, ‘it is a primary merit of oral history that, to a much greater extent than most sources, it allows the original multiplicity of standpoints to be recreated’. For these reasons, would not oral history archives be particularly useful when writing performance art histories? As the issue of ‘what really happened’ has been plaguing performance art since its emergence, oral history recordings could be a useful tool for documenting performance and post-performance art practices. Not only artists’, but also viewers’ and participants’ oral narratives


617 Dafni Vitali, ISET Conference: Audiovisual Art Archives.

618 The interest in archives of oral history has been manifested in Western world art museums since a long time ago. For instance, MoMA’s Museum Archives’ Institutional Oral History Program was founded in 1990. The program produced interviews with select individuals affiliated with the Museum, such as trustees, major donors, administrative and curatorial staff, artists, and dealers. In 2011 after receiving a generous grant from an anonymous donor the Museum Archives created the Artist Oral History Initiative for which artists were filmed in MoMA galleries and study centers discussing works in the collection with Museum curators and scholars.

619 Thomson, 2000, 6.
could be of significant importance to art historians’ efforts to record performance art. Records of viewer’s responses, feelings and thoughts on performance art pieces they attended or participated in could provide information that is not usually available through visual or written sources. Such information could be of great value, not only with regard to the meanings that were actually produced among viewers and beyond the artist’s intent during or after the performance, but also with regard to who are the audiences of performance art. This could help art history address both the disparity of engagement between a random or ‘general public’ and art lovers and museum goers; it could also help art history address the contextual relation between place, identity and reception. I return to this issue, though, in Chapter 5, where the question of performance documentation is analysed in detail.

Conclusions

The interest and attention drawn to minority groups and, in particular, refugees and immigrants in the projects discussed in this chapter is utterly justifiable. As discussed in previous chapters, the massive influx of immigrants and refugees in Greece and Europe since the early 1990s and especially during the civil war in Syria has culminated into major refugee crises. These crises have been compounded by the inhumane and ineffective immigration policies of governments that infringe fundamental human rights and have caused the deaths of thousands. Of course, these events have affected the host countries socially and economically, aggravating racist violence and hate speech. Immigrants and refugees are forced to live in the hundreds in unhygienic conditions, endure unemployment and rest in a state of ‘non-existence’, as discussed in detail in Chapter 1. The undocumented ‘non


621 I am referring here to the inhumane conditions of the detention camps for refugees but also to the fact that in many cases immigrants live crammed in apartment rooms, basements, warehouses and abandoned buildings in the centre of Athens, which are turned to illegal ‘hostels’ yielding great profit to their owners. See Médecins sans Frontières. 2014. Invisible Suffering: Prolonged and Systematic Detention of Migrants and Asylum-seekers in Substandard Conditions in Greece, [accessed 27/04/2015], Global Detention Project. 2014. Greece Immigration Detention, [accessed 27/04/2015], Vasilis Kanelis, ‘Χρυσές Μπίζνες’ [Gold en Business] Imerisia (27/04/2015).
citizens’ may remain ‘illegal’ and therefore ‘invisible’ all their life, even though their numerically massive presence in the past decade has made them more visible than ever.

The upsurge of interest in the immigrant subject in art is not a Greek particularity. Many artists around the world have addressed immigrant and refugee subjectivities through diverse performances, community-based projects and other forms of art. Apparently, so many artists are keen to work with displaced subjects that refugees themselves decided to give instructions to them. Through the Refugees, Survivors and Ex-detainees organisation in Australia, run by refugees, asylum seekers and ex-detainees, the refugees declare that if artists wish to work with them, they must respect them: ‘Nothing about us without us’.622 Under the title ‘10 Things You Need to Consider if You Are an Artist—Not of the Refugee and Asylum Seeker Community—Looking to Work with Our Community’, the refugees request, among other things, to be presented and not represented and to not be reduced to ‘an issue’. They also ask artists to do their research and realise their own privilege, declaring that participation is not always progressive or empowering.623 Is it possible to present and not represent without turning subjects into spectacle? And furthermore, is it possible for subjects to be presented as whole and not fragmented identities?

Drawing on the Greek case studies discussed in this chapter, it becomes evident that artists turn to both publics and counterpublics to explore the role of collaboration, invisibility and history in contemporary Greek society and democracy. Rita Felski and Nancy Fraser have been prominent articulators of the concept ‘counterpublics’, advocating recognition of the plurality of public spheres. For Felski (1989) counterpublic spheres are ‘critical oppositional forces that seek to disrupt the homogenising and universalising processes of a global mass-communication culture that promotes an uncritical consumerism’.624 Counterpublics ‘voice oppositional needs and values not by appealing to the universality of the bourgeois public


623 Ibid.

sphere but by affirming specificity of race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity or some other axis of difference’. Frazer describes counterpublics as ‘parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counterdiscourses to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests and needs’. Moreover, as Michael Warner notes, a counterpublic sustains, consciously or not, an awareness of its subordinate status. ‘The cultural horizon against which it marks itself off is not just a general or wider public but a dominant one’, which, in the cases examined in this chapter, is the secondary (non-participant) public.

With the inclusion of counterpublics in the production and reception of art, such projects address by default, though not always successfully in their own terms, issues of inclusion and exclusion, democratic politics and social justice. Inevitably, such concerns also point to identity politics and the conditions that reproduce racism increasingly as a normalised discourse. Although since the early 1990s, political and popular press rhetoric, along with European and American academic scholarship, has declared the ‘death’ of identity, I concur with Amelia Jones’ argument in Seeing Differently: A History and Theory of Identification and the Visual Arts (2012) that the supposed ‘post identity’ phase in Euro-American culture was never an actuality. The continuing systematic violence against a great range of subjects, along with the unbearable conditions of living imposed on some of them because of how they are identified, clearly indicates that identity politics is no way dated. As Jones maintains, ‘Issues of identification (how we identify the bodies we see, whether in representation or in real time and “live”) still guide and even predetermine every experience we have in the contemporary world’.

All the projects discussed in the chapter intended to subvert the invisibility of under-represented communities or, in other words, to turn counterpublics into publics. However, as Peggy Phelan has argued, visibility might sometimes be a trap, since it can provoke voyeurism and fetishism, both of which are pertinent criticisms of community-based projects.

---

625 Ibid.
626 Nancy Fraser. 1990. ‘Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy’, Social Text, 25/26: 56-80, 67.
629 Ibid., xxi.
that address so called minorities. Suggesting that ‘the binary between the power of visibility and the impotency of invisibility is falsifying’, Phelan argues that ‘while there is a deeply ethical appeal in the desire for a more inclusive representational landscape and certainly under-represented communities can be empowered by an enhanced visibility, the terms of this visibility can often enervate the putative power of these identities’.  

Thus the act of making visible could actually beget a new level of marginalisation and discrimination for such communities within the art world. The Greek case studies examined here are not exempted from this risk.

Although the intention of the projects discussed is to subvert the invisibility of the participant minorities, in some cases they might be seen to reinforce it. The participants are chosen because of one specific aspect of their identity related to their precarious subjectivity. The immigrants, the refugees, the Roma, the left-behind community of de-industrialised Eleusina and all the other ‘minorities’ involved in such projects are entire entities with diverse skills, beliefs, experiences and knowledge. Their identity is not one-dimensional, but it may be presented as such in the artistic process. There is ambivalence, therefore, about the outcomes of such artistic practices since the reduction of the participants to singular narrative subjects raises the risk of emphasising stabilised identities instead of attempting to destabilise them.

The idea of fixed cultures and their fixed identities has been a product of global discourse in the media and is rooted in older anthropological approaches that named cultures and drew boundaries between societies. Likewise, official policies that compose ethnic, racial and other identities also contribute to ‘the essentialisation of ethnicity as primordial or natural’, thus sustaining ‘minorities’ as different from members of the prevailing culture. As Katherine Pratt Ewing notes, ‘With respect to public and official discourses, the fixing of identities is a basic means by which the state contributes to the ordering of the social world. State authorities bestow identities through law, public policy, and routinised practices in everyday arena…’. That identities are not conclusively fixed and that the individual is a locus of multiple, even conflicting identities is not exactly news any more. Even so, immigrant populations are defined by their collective identities and are referred to as ‘ethnic minorities’, a fact which is also dominant in the art projects they participate in. As Michel Foucault asserted throughout his work, subjects do not have a pre-given or fixed identity within

---

630 Phelan, 1996, 7.
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themselves, but are in fact mediated by the many and diverse discourses they encounter each day. Identity is in effect a shifting, temporary codified construction, a form of subjugation and a way of exercising power: ‘The individual, with his identity and characteristics, is the product of a relation of power exercised over bodies, multiplicities, movements, desires, forces’. Foucault therefore advocates the dissolution of identities rather than their consolidation and preservation.

Although scholars now recognise that identities are neither primordial nor essential, they continue to exist in public culture and the social world as ‘reified symbols and markers of social position and cultural difference that are embodied in individuals within specific social and political contexts’. However, individuals are not the carriers of a single identity; on the contrary, they assume manifold, shifting identities, and immigrants and ‘minorities’ are not to be excluded. Projects addressing the problems of ‘integration’ of minorities by adopting the premise of fixed identities (instead of their fluidity) seem to validate the ideologically imposed identities instead of confront them. Furthermore, the notion of integration as a form of inclusion might also be problematic since it implies acceptance and consensus, which conforms to/complies with the dominant power structures and places democratic equality at risk.

Although the participants are asked to share their personal stories so as to reconstruct established historical narratives, their names and capacities are usually dismissed from the records of such projects. In the end, the participants remain anonymous during these artistic efforts to subvert their very anonymity and invisibility. For example, few of the personal stories from the people along the Egnatia Road are mentioned in Along the Egnatia, the project’s guide-catalogue produced by the Greek team; additionally, none of the residents in Lavrio are mentioned by name anywhere. In the catalogue of T.A.M.A., the residents of Avliza are mentioned by first names and as ‘Avliza resident’, in contrast to all the other participants, who are identified with their full names and occupations. Conversely, in Human Trace, all the participants’ full names are included in the catalogue.

All three projects intended to promote equality, recognition of difference, respect for the other and acknowledgement of fundamental liberties and human rights. All were transferred

634 Katherine Pratt Ewing, 2004, 118.
635 According to Tranos, some of the participants requested to remain anonymous. Interview with the author (18/11/2016).
from the political arena to art, accompanied by a mode of political correctness emphasising and fostering participation as manifestation of inclusion.\textsuperscript{636} They all celebrate their chosen subjects in some way, taking a positive stance and omitting any discussion of possible negative aspects. Consequently, even when the complexity of social conditions is addressed, convention is to seek these subjects’ empowerment naively, which ultimately presents these subjects as victims of always external conditions. In addition, the inclusion of marginalised and excluded publics whose voice needs to be heard over museum and gallery goers’, presumes that the working class can only engage physically with art, while the middle-class publics have the ability and leisure to think critically and reflect. This way, and despite their political correctness, all the discussed projects seem to reassert prejudice identifying the working-class with manual labour.\textsuperscript{637}

Alternatively, such projects could also be examined under the prism of ‘connective aesthetics’ and be valued for the politics of friendship they foster; though, such an approach again carries some risk. In all the case studies examined, the artists adopt and promote the concept of ‘empathic listening’, namely emotional identification, compassion, feeling and insight while their personal relations with some of the participants developed into friendships.\textsuperscript{638} Papadimitriou became close friends with the family she built the house for, Tranos claimed that the group Savra developed friendships with some of the residents in Lavrio through their regular meetings, and Spiliopoulos asserted that throughout the years he spent researching and working on his project in Eleusina, he befriended some of the residents who were involved. In a way, the projects defended and fostered their democratic values (equality, justice and liberty) not only through including minorities and developing social relations, but also and more specifically through a politics of friendship. The link between democracy and the marginal concept of friendship (at least within political philosophy) was drawn by Jacques Derrida in \textit{The Politics of Friendship} (1994). For Derrida, the possibility of a deeper and more inclusive democracy can and should relate to the invention of a radically new friendship. Through an examination of the political history of friendship, the philosopher

\textsuperscript{636} Discussing participatory/collaborative projects of art activism and their structures, Fotiadi notes that ‘the demand for the participation of migrant subjects in political discourses was transferred to art, in the form of the migrants’ participation as subjects both in production processes and resulting presentations and representations of art projects. See Eva Fotiadi. 2012. ‘Doing Language: Narratives from an Activists’ World in the Austrian Art World of the 1990s: The Art Activism of WochenKlausur, Martin Krenn, Oliver Ressler and maiz’. \textit{RIHA Journal}, 0062 (10 December), \url{http://www.riha-journal.org/articles/2012/2012-oct-dec/fotiadi-doing-language/#__RefHeading__392013_623944600} [accessed 12/12/2016].

\textsuperscript{637} See Claire Bishop. 2012. \textit{Artificial Hells} (Verso), 37-40.

\textsuperscript{638} ‘Empathic listening’ is a term used by Susi Gablik. See Gablik, 1995.
argues that there is some type of ‘political experience in friendship and hospitality’ and that friendship ‘plays an organising role in the definition of justice, of democracy even’.\textsuperscript{639}

Following the thread of the paradoxes between friendship and politics, Derrida pinpoints a prevailing canonical model of friendship which has been dominant and hegemonic from ancient Greece to now. The features of this prevailing, traditional, canonical concept of friendship (which could be politically meaningful and significant) roughly compose a phallogocentric model of friendship developed ‘between two young men, mortals, who have a contract according to which one will survive the other, one will be the heir of the other, and they will agree politically’.\textsuperscript{640} Woman as the friend of a man or women as friends among themselves are totally excluded from this model of friendship, while the figure of brother and therefore the phallogocentric schema of fraternity is dominant. As Derrida explains, this concept of brotherhood derives from Greece, but is also the Christian model by which men are all brothers as sons of God.\textsuperscript{641}

All fundamental political concepts, such as sovereignty, power, representation, the nation-state and even democracy, were directly or indirectly marked by this canonical concept of the privileged sharing of the phallogocentric social bond of friendship.\textsuperscript{642} Democracy, Derrida notes, means equality among everyone. Friendship is thereby an important key since it involves reciprocity, equality and so forth. This demand for equality has to be reconciled, though, with the demand for singularity, ‘with respect for the Other as singular’.\textsuperscript{643} Thus, Derrida poses a question pertaining to the inability of the post-performance practices examined to designate or reveal the multiplicity of heterogeneous identities: ‘How can we, at the same time, take into account the equality of everyone, justice and equity, and nevertheless take into account and respect the heterogeneous singularity of everyone?’\textsuperscript{644}

Democracy has always been associated with values which belong to the canonical concept of friendship as ‘brotherhood, family, roots in a territory (autochthony), the nation-state


\textsuperscript{640} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{641} Derrida is referencing Aristotle’s designation of three types of friendship: the first one based on virtue and not politics being developed between two virtuous men, the second one grounded on utility and usefulness being a political friendship and the third one grounded on pleasure. See Jacques Derrida [Translated by George Collins]. 2005 [1997]. The Politics of Friendship (Verso), 227-270.


\textsuperscript{643} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{644} Ibid.
depending on a territory, soil and place, and so on'. 645 Derrida invites us then to think of a democracy beyond the confines of classical politics and the prevalent canonical concept of friendship, articulated with another experience of friendship, not reducible to citizenship and the borders of the nation-state.

In *Politics of Friendship*, Derrida is also in favour of what he calls ‘unconditional hospitality’, which pertains to both friendship and democracy, especially in relation to the urgent condition of people of non-citizenship. The philosopher underscores that when one wishes to offer unconditional hospitality (without asking for a document, a name, a context, or a passport), one should accept that the Other may impose his or her own culture, language, etc., and ‘ruin’ the space of the host. Unconditionality can therefore be frightening. Entering one’s space unconditionally (by ‘space’, Derrida refers to the house, home, city, state, language) may displace, upset, undermine, even destroy everything. 646 Therefore, hospitality, which is in diverse ways employed and fostered by the projects discussed in the chapter, ‘should be neither assimilation, acculturation, nor simply the occupation of my space by the Other’. 647 Hospitality defines one’s relations to the Other, and it has to be reinvented as a new language, as ‘a new way of translating in which translation doesn’t simply go one way but both ways’, as a new form of politics. Derrida does not, however, state how such a reinvention can be achieved. It is perhaps unconditionality in hospitality and friendship could be the grounds for the utopian cosmopolitan democracy that socially engaged art strives for, a democracy beyond citizenships and without international laws keeping alive state sovereignty.

Suzi Gablik in her text on ‘connective aesthetics’ takes for granted that empathic listening—which is employed, or at least claimed, in all the projects discussed—‘makes room for the Other and decentralises the ego-self. Giving each person a voice is what builds community and makes art socially responsive. Interaction becomes the medium of expression, an empathic way of seeing through another’s eye’. 648 Suzanne Lacy suggests that the artist, ‘like a subjective anthropologist [enters] the territory of the Other, and... becomes a conduit for [their] experience. The work becomes a metaphor for relationship—which has a healing power’. 649 Although the healing power of art or of the relationships that might come out of it
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645 Ibid.
646 Ibid. See also Derrida, 2005, 75-111.
647 Ibid.
648 Gablik, 1995, 82.
649 Ibid.
through empathetic conversation might benefit the participants—and despite the fact that this healing power cannot be in effect proven or measured—Gablik and Lacy seem to overoptimistically disregard socially engaged art’s possibility for failure, such as the impossibility of unconditionality because of the perils it might entail.

Finally, to draw connections between such post-performance practices and performance art, it is important to note the evident displacement from the artist’s body to the bodies of others. The artist allegedly abandons ‘the stage’ and acquires the role of a coordinator, director, organiser in an effort to promote his or her ‘absence’, make him- or herself less visible, foreground the subjects of his or her art and enforce their visibility not only in the sphere of art but also in the social and political spheres.

What connects such multi-layered projects to performance art is the notion of performativity which is in fact twofold; in most art history essays, performativity is related to action taken by either the artist or the participant audience. Yet, the performativity of the performance artist should be, and is in a way, distinct from the performativity of the primary audience engaged in collaborative projects as the ones discussed in this chapter. In most cases when artists are performing, either on a ‘stage’ of an exhibition space or in a public or other space, they are performing an act, even if this act is revealing of an identity or intended to critique the processes of identity formation. In most cases this act is premeditated and to some extend calculated, while spontaneity is usually contingent upon the viewers’ response. In post-performance practices, when the participant (counter)publics/ communities/individuals are asked to perform—before a secondary audience, a camera or just the artist—they are actually asked to perform their own identities, or rather the specific aspects of their identities for which they have been chosen to participate in the first place. In this sense, the notion of performativity is more closely related to Judith Butler’s definition than to the notion of being active or performing an act. For Butler, performativity is associated with gender; it constitutes an anti-essentialist theory on subjectivity according to which the self in terms of gender identity is formed through repetitive actions dependent upon a social audience. Gender is, therefore, not something one is, but something one does, a sequence of acts.\(^{650}\) The case could be similar for all sorts of identities people acquire. Butler, however, clearly distinguishes between performance and performativity:

Performance as bounded ‘act’ is distinguished from performativity insofar as the latter consists in a reiteration of norms which precede, constrain, and exceed the performer and in that sense cannot be taken as the fabrication of the performer’s ‘will’ or ‘choice’; further, what is ‘performed’ works to conceal, if not to disavow, what remains opaque, unconscious, unperformable. The reduction of performativity to performance would be a mistake.\(^651\)

Thus, in contrast to Pablo Helguera’s argument that ‘performance is embedded’ in socially engaged art, I would argue that performance is in fact deflected in socially engaged art despite the performative (in the sense of active) aspect of the artist’s operation and because of the performative in the sense of identity formation through continual reiteration of the participants’ mode of operation.\(^652\) Hence, by adding the prefix ‘post’ in performative practices, ‘performance’ is actually removed out of and replaced by ‘the performative’. The wish, indeed premise, of performance art for the intrusion of art into life appears somewhat reversed in post-performance practices where it is not art that meddles in life, but life itself that becomes art.


Chapter 5

Making the Invisible Visible: Performance, Intermediality and the Document

Introduction

Although performance art, on account of its ephemerality, has been inextricably connected to the document since its very emergence, and despite the extensive discourse on the subject that has taken place mainly since the 1990s in the West, the exploration of the complex relationship between ‘the live’ and ‘the mediated’ is neither outdated nor exhausted. On the contrary, the intense preoccupation of many contemporary artists, curators, art scholars and institutions with performance and live art the last two decades or so has also brought to the forefront the question of documentation.

Most commonly, the documentation of performance art includes photographs, videos and texts. Sound recordings, materials and remnants that were used in the process or for the staging of the work, original invitation cards and flyers are less often used as documentation but can usually be found in archives. All forms are, however, produced and saved in order to avoid the performance’s disappearance. It is therefore through documentation that performance art is made accessible to larger audiences and preserved in art histories. Yet, as shown later in this chapter through the Greek paradigm, it is questionable whether documentation in itself can guarantee performance art’s visibility and inclusion in art history.

The revolution of digital media in the past few decades has been defining in the production and distribution of performance documentation; it has provided easy and low-cost access to photography and video and provided unlimited distribution possibilities through the internet. The technological revolution, along with the increasing need for documentation, has led to diverse and in some cases contradictory stances towards the document.

This chapter therefore explores a range of perspectives on the relationship between performance and documentation practices, reflecting on the conditions of document production, circulation and preservation in Greece. It also investigates the dominant ideologies of liveness and presence that in some cases trump the value of documentation. Specifically, the chapter is divided into five parts. The first part explores in what ways the
production and dissemination of performance documentation have changed since the emergence of performance art in the country. It also exposes in what ways the undervaluation of the document has affected the visibility of performance art and artists in Greece. The second part of the chapter focuses on the dominant privileging of live over mediated experience. The discussion develops around the obsession with the production of experiences and the shift in art discourse from the production of meaning to the production of feeling and affect. The third part touches upon re-enactment as an alternative to the exhibition of documents and discusses how this practice complicates the artistic work. The fourth part, through specific case studies, examines the rejection of visual documentation and the possibility of an alternative way to document performance so as to transmit the viewer’s experience rather than the artist’s action. Finally, the last part of the chapter discusses the positioning of performance art within the art market and the undervaluation of performance artists’ labour. Through the Greek paradigm, this chapter attempts to subvert the dominant conviction that performance artists are first and foremost interested in the ‘here and now’ of performance and suggests an exploration of the document as a terrain of multiple potentialities and alternative experiences.

1. Documenting and Archiving Performance Art: Then and Now

1.1 Documenting in the 1960s and 1970s: The Outset of Performance Art Documentation

There is both quantitative and qualitative difference in the visual documents of performance art produced in the 1960s and 1970s and those produced later (especially after 2000). Sparse analogue black and white photographs, super 8mm cameras and later video recordings have all been replaced by an abundance of digital recordings. In what way does, however, the profusion of documents make a difference to the representation, dissemination and reception of performance art? Moreover, what is documentation’s purpose? Is it to capture the performance itself or the experience it provided and, more broadly, its impact?

Liveness in conjunction with realness have been deemed the elements of performance art that distinguish it from theatrical performance and object-based art. The great emphasis on the immediacy of experience and ephemerality—conditions that have also been associated with anti-capitalist critique—together with the sometimes poor quality and/or quantity of documentation has begot the impression that performance artists in the 1960s and 1970s were
primarily or only interested in the ‘here and now’ and not in the future of their work. The artist and assistant professor at the University of Western Macedonia Angeliki Agvitidou, in her essay ‘It Is Complicated: Notes on the Relationship between Archive and Performance Art’ (2016), notes that the scant documentation of performances in the 1970s is most likely associated with the genre’s appraisal as an art form that challenged commodification and blocked the artwork’s circulation in the art market. Such a premise implies that performance artists intentionally refused to document their performances to resist their objectification and therefore commodification. Yet, it is highly unlikely that performance artists were uninterested in the preservation and further distribution of their work through documentation, even in the cases where their action carried some risk and its documentation would constitute evidence of an illegal action, such as in Greece and Eastern Europe where any sort of dissident art would provoke the artists’ persecution and arrest by the respectively dictatorial and communist regimes. It is my contention that performance artists were clearly interested in the production of documents; they simply did not intend to exhibit or sell them. Thus, what they denounced was not the production, but the circulation of documents in the art market and their handling as art objects to be exhibited in galleries and museums. It is rather only recently that a few artists in Greece and elsewhere have rejected the visual document as a means to exhibit and distribute performance, as discussed later in the chapter.

Despite its alleged unmediated liveness, performance art has always been at the same time live and mediated through photography and/or video (not only in the West and in the context of dominant paradigms, but also in the cases of Greece and Eastern Europe). The adequate documentation of Western performances can be traced in the relevant publications, wherein references to performance art pieces are in their vast majority—if not in all cases—

656 Kathy O’Dell in her article ‘Displacing the Haptic: Performance Art, the Photographic Document and the 1970s’ analyses the photographs of performance art in terms of haptic and visual experience. She argues that those photographs ‘were meant to be handled as much as they were viewed’ as opposed to being exhibited in galleries or museums where prohibitions on touching apply. In building her argument, she mentions that performance photographs in the 1970s were mainly circulated in art magazines, journals or books and catalogues published very often by the artists themselves. The viewing and the handling of such photographs would therefore take place primarily in the home, being the logical destination of a publication that one might purchase.
657 As Phillip Auslander, referring to Western artists, has noted ‘although some of the early documentation of performance and body art was not carefully planned or conceived as such, performance artists who were interested in preserving their work quickly became fully conscious of the need to stage it for the camera and future audiences as much as for any immediately present spectators, if not more so.’ Phillip Auslander. 2010. ‘Towards a Hermeneutics of Performance Art Documentation’, in J. Ekberg (ed.), Kunsten a Falle: Lessons in the Art of Falling (Preus Museum), 93.
accompanied by photographs, even if of low quality. Such a fact underlines the profound importance of the document for the preservation and study of performance art as a genre: undocumented performances may as well be excluded from histories of performance art (which remain highly visual, like art history overall). Early performance artists that might have chosen to not document their work have been excluded from exhibitions, archives and publications and seem to have been lost in oblivion. This does not mean, however, that all performances excluded from publications have not been documented; it means rather that only a small number of performances have become visible and formed the history of the genre, while the majority may remain unexamined and forgotten, as has happened in with Greek performance art.

Along with the upsurge of performance art in the 2000s, a renewed interest in performance documentation has also become evident. The exhibition Live Art on Camera: Performance and Photography (18 September to 10 November 2007) realised at John Hansard Gallery in Southampton, England and its following eponymous publication, MoMA’s Staging Action: Performance in Photography since 1960 (28 January to 9 May 2011) and TATE’s project Performance at Tate: Collecting, Archiving and Sharing Performance and the Performative (October 2014 to September 2016) are indicative examples that show not only that is there a great volume of photographic and other material for past performances which remains hidden and unexplored in artists’, photographers’ and filmmakers’ archives, but also that performance art has been recorded in incredibly varying methods and styles.

In Greece, performance art’s exclusion from art history discourses for many decades does not derive from a lack of documentation. It seems that the first artists engaging with performance art had realised the contingency of live art and the need for a document, and, despite the conditions and risks of censorship, they did not neglect to document performances with photographs. Karavela, as discussed in Chapter 1, had stated that although an artwork of

656 Jennie Klein in her essay ‘Developing Live Art’, notes that, ‘due to lack of documentation (at least from the early years of performance art practice in the 1960s and 1970s) as well as its ephemeral, time-based nature, performance/live art has, until recently, been given relatively short shrift in publications devoted to contemporary art’ in Deidre Heddon and Jenny Klein (eds). 2012. Histories and Practices of Live Art (Palgrave Macmillan), 12. Amelia Jones in her article “The Artist is Present” Artistic Re-enactments and the Impossibility of Presence’ (TDR/ The Drama Review Spring 55/1: 16-45, 19) in which she discusses the latest trend in the world of performance art, namely the practice of re-enactment, notes that ‘At the time of the “original,” in the mid-1970s—a period when performances in the European and North American context were raw, often undocumented, and frequently spontaneous...’. And yet it is nowhere explained how we know about these undocumented performances and why no one has ever written about them since their existence is somehow known.

ephemeral nature carries out its destination in a given time, it may live on afterwards as a memory through the document. This statement indicates her interest in the document as carrier of the past and probably a definer of the genre’s future.658 The poor documentation of her performative environments and performances does not seem to originate, therefore, in her intention not to record them, but rather in the afterlife of the document, namely its collection, preservation and display.659

1.2 Diversifying and Expanding Meaning through the Document

The most consistent Greek performance artist of the 1970s, Leda Papaconstantinou, has paid great attention to the documentation of her performances, not only to preserve them in the histories of live art, but also because she believed photographs could help her discover unseen aspects of her work.660 In an interview with Alice Maude-Roxby for Live Art on Camera, Papaconstantinou refers to the various photographers she has worked with through the years and explains the different influences each one of them had on the depiction of her performances. The durational performance Deaf and Dumb (1971), repeated for over a week in several different locations in London and Maidstone, was photographed by her friend, the painter and photographer Roy Tunnicliffe. The artist had painted large eyes on her closed eyelids and walked about carrying a sign below her breast with the statement, ‘I am deaf and dumb, please communicate with me in other ways’. Though the photographer spent a lot of time with the artist during the performance, he chose to make two portraits of her a week after. In one Papaconstantinou has her eyes painted as in the performance, and in the other—which has not been circulated—she is wearing dark sunglasses. As the artist notes, ‘He liked the idea of a portrait where one cannot see the eyes, where eye contact is denied’.661

658 Maria Karavela, 1970, Έκθεση Χώρου της Μαρίας Καραβέλα’, Interview in Vima newspaper, found in Great Unrest (exhibition catalogue), 196. Papaconstantinou was also explicitly interested in the documentation of her work as I will explain further on in the chapter.

659 The poor documentation of Karavela’s performative environments and performances is also a result of the fire that broke out in her working place in 1996. Along with the project she worked on at the time, many of her archives were also destroyed.


661 Ibid., 39.
Figure 5.1: Leda Papaconstantinou, *Deaf & Dumb*, 1971, Performance, Maidstone and London, UK.

From these photographs, one cannot actually see the artist in action. Without her account of the performance, it is impossible to understand that the artist was walking about in public spaces and actually had an audience, the passers-by. What the photograph documents is a performance staged for the camera (since it was taken a week after the performance that occurred in the streets) and directed by the photographer (who wished to make specific portraits of her). The document therefore raises the question of whether the photograph is documentation of Papaconstantinou’s work or the product of Tunnicliffe’s work, or a combination of both. The performance in this case is not just being documented, but is rather *translated* into photography. This approach of documentation is closer to Manuel Vason’s photographic collaborations with performance artists than to a traditional documentarian approach.⁶⁶²

---

The influence of the photographer’s ideas or style was present in the documentation of Papaconstantinou and Lesley Walton’s (alias Sally Smith) performance *The Box* (1981) discussed in Chapter 2. The gallery where the piece was presented chose Erricos Meliones, a fashion photographer. As the artist explains, the photographs were completely removed from her idea of what it means to record work:

They were too glossy, too pretty. The actuality of the piece was quite different from what the pictures show. It was much messier in reality; it was quite grotesque and not at all glamorous. We lived for hours each day in those small spaces, 1.5 cubic metres. It was hot and smelled bad. The photographer chose angles carefully in order to cut all that mess out.  

Again, the production of documentation was aestheticised by the photographer, but in this case the document gives not only a different narrative to the performance, but also a different meaning from the one the artist intended. In contrast, Papaconstantinou also refers to Alexis Stamatiadis, who recorded many of her performances though he was not a professional photographer but a ‘photography maniac’; he was also her best friend’s husband, which means she had a personal relationship with him. Referring to the performance *Dim Landscape* (1982), Papaconstantinou states that the photographs ‘seem incredibly true to the piece, absolutely representing how it was’ and that Stamatiadis ‘felt a part of the performance’ unlike the fashion photographer who was simply a professional who visited the piece three or four times to get the shots. It is evident and reasonable that the aesthetics of photographic documentation is affected not only by the photographer’s profession and specialisation, but also by his or her relation to the artist and involvement in the work process. The same could be said for video documentation whose aesthetic outcome, though less fragmented, is also influenced by the one who holds the camera and chooses the frames and angles. However, the possible gap between the artist’s intention and the photographer’s
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663 Papaconstantinou and Maude-Roxby. 2007, 39-40.
664 Ibid., 40.
665 Ibid., 40.

---

the photographic camera has not been common practice. Alexandros Plomaritis is perhaps, at least to my knowledge, the only Greek performance artist who, apart from performing live for an audience, has been consistently staging performances to create photographic images since the late 2000s. Chrissie Tsiota and Venia Bechrakis are also engaging with performative photography but as photographers rather than performance artists. Vason has collaborated with Greek artists several times (in 2009, 2013 and 2016) during different performance art workshops and festivals. Regarding Greek video art see Areti Adamopoulou. 2006. ‘Video Art: Ηi-Τεχ και Τέχνη’ [Video Art: Hi-tech and Art in Greece], *Egnatia* [Egnatia], 5: 9-52 and Katerina Iliopoulou (ed.). 2009. *IntoThePill: Greek Contemporary Video Art* 01. About Alexandros Plomaritis’s work see *http://cargocollective.com/alexandrosplomaritis* [accessed 5/3/2016].
perception of the performance, depicted on the photographic document, can only be detected by the artist and perhaps those who initially experienced the pieces live. And yet, that the aesthetics of a photograph may not always align with the artist’s intentions should not necessarily perceived as negative or a ‘defect’ of the document. Since the meaning-making process is not solely attributed to the artists themselves anymore, the document itself (by providing a second life for the performance) may become the generator of new diverse meanings that may or may not be in agreement with the artist’s ideas. According to art historian Anne Marsh, ‘photographs read out of context and without embellishment don’t convey the depth or the context of the event. This is an issue that plagues performance art’. Although I agree that photographs without any further elaboration may not be able to convey the ‘depth’ or ‘context’ of a performance, does this not also apply to other artworks of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries? The introduction of ready-mades into art would be such a case. Encountering Marcel Duchamp’s *Fountain* in a museum or a photograph, for instance, would also make no sense to someone unfamiliar with the complex history of this work. Photographic documentation cannot always represent the whole action, but this hardly means that documentation is inherently inadequate as an interpretation tool. The limitations of photographic documentation suggest, rather, that performance documentation should expand beyond the provision of only visual documents, as I discuss in detail later.

The interrelation between artist, documenter and visual document is complex and can be problematic in respect not only to meaning production but also authorship. Despite the documenters’ impact on performances’ afterlives, their names are hardly ever mentioned in the photographs’ captions in publications or exhibitions. This means that the photographs
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666 The legacy of postmodernism has been important in questioning the author-artist as the sole or even primary source of meaning. See Roland Barthes’ widely influential essay ‘The Death of the Author’ (1967), included in Roland Barthes. 1977. *Image-Music-Text*, [translated by Stephen Heath] (Fontana Press).


668 In 2015 *Fountain* was revealed to have been created by pioneering performance artist Baroness Elsa von Freytag-Loringhoven’s and not by Duchamp. See John Higgs. 2015. *Stranger Than We Can Imagine: Making Sense of the Twentieth Century* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson Ltd). A book extract referring to this revelation can be found at [http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/art/features/was-marcel-duchamps-fountain-actually-created-by-a-long-forgotten-pioneering-feminist-10491953.html](http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/art/features/was-marcel-duchamps-fountain-actually-created-by-a-long-forgotten-pioneering-feminist-10491953.html) [accessed 10/2/2017].

669 There is a long discussion among scholars on whether it is possible to interpret and appraise a performance through documentation without having been ‘there’ to which I will return in the next part of the chapter.

670 In the case of Leda Papaconstantinou for instance, in her book *Leda Papaconstantinou: Performance, Film, Video 1969 – 2004* the photographers are only mentioned in the last page of the book while in the photographs exhibited in the permanent exhibition at the *Macedonian Museum of Contemporary Art* they are not mentioned at all. Two of the most frequently cited publications on performance art, RoseLee Goldberg’s *Performance: Live Art since the 60s* and Tracey Warr & Amelia Jones’s *The artist’s Body* include a huge amount of photographic documentation while none of the photographers is mentioned. Accordingly, none of the photographers’ names
and videos, at least in most cases, are not acknowledged as the photo- or videographer’s labour but the artist’s. Such a condition foregrounds two different yet related issues. The first pertains to the author’s rights. A court in Düsseldorf decided that the Museum Schloss Moyland in Germany does not have the right to exhibit photographs of a 1964 performance by Joseph Beuys, *The Silence of Marcel Duchamp Is Overrated*, taken by art photographer Manfred Tischer. The court ruled in favour of VG Bild-Kunst, an organisation that collects copyright payments for German artists and their estate representatives. The museum, however, has appealed against the decision.671 Manfred Tischer was documenting art in Düsseldorf the years 1958 to 1985. As stated in a website about his work, ‘He had devoted his life to portraying the art-scene, both in his beloved Düsseldorf and internationally’.672 This is just one example out of many in which the photographer’s participation in the production and circulation of performance documentation is disregarded.

1.3 Living in the Present and Documenting for the Future

That Greek artists in the 1970s or later did not actively reject or purposefully avoid the production of documentation becomes evident in the case of Dimitris Alithinos, one of the most visible artists in the Greek performance scene. The artist stated in conversation with the author that he never had his own photographer or owned a camera himself, because he was never interested in documents; he has always preferred to ‘live in the present and not in the history of the present’ instead. Still, documentation of his performances does exist and has been exhibited and used in exhibition catalogues. Visual documents of his work are preserved in both the ISET’s (Contemporary Greek Art Institute) and the artist’s personal archives. As he explains, in January 1979 when he presented his performance *Visual Action—Writing in Space* realised in collaboration with Desmos Art Centre (the performance took place on the sidewalk of Academia Street in the centre of Athens and in Desmos’ basement) the gallery had hired a photographer to document the action in black and white film. However, the artist had also asked a friend to document the performance in coloured slides. The coloured slides were, however, underexposed and turned out to be useless. ‘Luckily, we still had the black
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671 Harris Gareth, ‘Performance Art in the Marketplace’, *The Financial Times* (8 October 2010), [https://www.ft.com/content/e939b02-d19f-11df-b3e1-00144feabdc0](https://www.ft.com/content/e939b02-d19f-11df-b3e1-00144feabdc0) [accessed 10/08/2016].

and white photographs as the only documentation of the work’, the artist stated. Twenty-five years later, the friend of the artist, director Giorgos Maris, revealed to him that he had been present in the performance and had recorded it. After some searching in ‘the chaos of his basement’, Maris found a 16mm film approximately ten minutes length and handed it over to the artist. ‘Thus, totally randomly I acquired a short but valuable visual document of that work’, the artist stated. The contradiction in the artist’s claims—that he is interested only in living in the present, but, on the other hand, wishes also to rescue somehow his work from oblivion—discloses a romanticised approach to the genre of performance art: according to which it is only ‘the present’ and ‘the presence’ that matter and thus also prevail over the ‘dead’ and ‘misleading’ document that is only reminiscent of the past. Such a perspective has been adopted by several performance artists and scholars not only in Greece but elsewhere, too, and is symptomatic of the conflict between the desire to place performance beyond the normative structures of the art world and the desire to inscribe performance in art history—an issue to which I return in the second part of this chapter. The importance of ‘living in the present’ is also emphasised in Zen Buddhism, which is practiced by Marina Abramović. The so called ‘grandmother of performance art’ has been ‘training’ performance artists for a few years now and is a leading example of such an approach. Yet without documentation, performance artists would not have been able to, as Amelia Jones puts it, secure their position ‘as beloved object[s] of the art world’s desires.’ In other words, it is highly unlikely that they would have been able to build careers without evidence of their action. In our discussion on the document, Alithinos also revealed that when the first performance of his
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673 Dimitris Alithinos, communication with the author (11/11/2016).
674 Ibid.
677 Abramović herself admits in an interview ‘From the very early stage when I started doing performance art in the ’70s, the general attitude—not just me, but also my colleagues—was that there should not be any documentation, that the performance itself is artwork and there should be no documentation. Documentation is misleading, because the performance is dead. So the very early works were not documented at all. But then I started thinking, this is not right, I would be left with nothing. I had to leave some traces. In the beginning, I would give complete instructions to the photographer. In the ’70s, people would come to photograph your work and you would just end up with this crazy material that had nothing to do with your work; maybe I’d pick up two or three photographs that were the closest to the idea. This is why when you look at the ’70s, you see much less documentation and really bad material. The material will become misleading to what the piece was’. Bryce J. Renninger. 2012. ‘Marina Abramović Explains How HBO and Lady Gaga Bring Performance Art to a New Audience’, IndieWire, http://www.indiewire.com/2012/01/sundance-interview-marina-abramovic-explains-how-hbo-and-lady-gaga-bring-performance-art-to-a-new-audience-49579/ [accessed 3/9/2016]
long-term project *Concealments* was realised in Thessaloniki in 1981, it was not documented, which led some art professionals to openly doubt that it had ever taken place. Later performances of the project were therefore all documented as evidence, the artist explained.\(^{678}\) Extensive documentation of this project was used in the artist’s retrospective exhibition in 2013.\(^ {679}\)

1.4 The Question of Self-Historicisation

The problem that plagues performance art in Greece is not the absence of documentation but the extreme difficulty in locating it. The problem stems from the absence of infrastructure normally provided by the state. State institutions that should have been collecting, preserving and displaying documentation of ephemeral art either did not exist or ignored such art. Thus, collecting, archiving and sometimes documenting as well became a personal task of the artists themselves. Visual documents need processing to be preserved, exhibited and made available to the public. Especially in the cases of super 8s, video recordings and analogue photographs, the material has to be digitalised, a process that can only be undertaken with the artist’s personal initiative and expense since no state institution has committed to financially support it. There is no state or private funding artists can apply for so as to document work.

Similar was the case in Eastern Europe (though not anymore) and possibly in other countries outside the dominant and well-organised West; although documentation did exist, its mishandling had generated the impression that it was intentionally avoided by the artists. For instance, in the revised editions of *Performance Art: From Futurism to Present* (2001, 2011) RoseLee Goldberg includes a one-page discussion of performance art in Eastern Europe wherein, considering the socio-political conditions (i.e. communism) under which performance artists operated in Eastern Europe, she suggests that artists turned to performance art because of the art form’s immateriality. The threat of censorship, police surveillance and the risk of arrest, according to Goldberg, led artists to pursue the production of artworks that would not leave traces; this implies that the production of documents would

\(^{678}\) Dimitris Alithinos, communication with the author (11/11/2016).

have been risky and unsafe.\textsuperscript{680} Such a conclusion could be easily, but misleadingly, drawn in the case of Greece as well, since dissident performance art taking place during the dictatorship (1967–1974) was illegal and the artists could be persecuted, as discussed in Chapter 1. Yet, this was not the case either for Greece or Eastern Europe. In contradiction to Goldberg’s premise from 2001, art historian Amy Bryzgel has more recently argued that performance art in Eastern Europe left significant traces through photographic, textual and video documentation. These, along with the artists’ verbal accounts (in the lack of any critical discourse surrounding performance in the institution), have rendered possible research on the development of the genre in the region.\textsuperscript{681}

The fact that performance art has been labelled an immaterial art is in fact quite problematic since, as Bojana Kunst has noted, even the most immaterial artistic events have a firm basis and are namely ‘based on the materiality of the effort and human force. At the core of the aesthetic arrangement of events, there is always human potentiality—that of the human gesture or the experience of life.’\textsuperscript{682} What is most evident in performance art is the artists’ investment in the body, whether this is their own body or the public’s. While the body consists of concrete physical matter, its elusive materiality is most commonly transferred to the document revealing the (still) object-oriented history of contemporary art which considers the object as static and immutable. In 1968, when Lucy Lippard and John Chandler coined the term ‘dematerialisation of art’, they shifted the focus from art as object to art as process and specifically as idea and action. They suggested that ‘in the first case [art as idea], matter is denied, as sensation has been converted into concept; in the second case [art as action], matter has been transformed into energy and time-motion’.\textsuperscript{683} Yet, both concept and energy continue to derive from matter (object or body/subject); in performance art, action and interaction are produced through the intersection of the body or subject with matter, whether other
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\textsuperscript{681} Amy Bryzgel. 2014. ‘Continuity and Change: Performance Art In Eastern Europe since the 1960s’, \textit{IDEA arts + society}, issue 45, 111. It is only in Latvia, as art historian and head of the research study on the nonconformist art heritage of Latvia’s Soviet years Ieva Astahovska notes, that there is no visual documentation for many performances because ‘at the time no one found them particularly important’ and not on account of an anti-commercialization of art context since in Latvia performance was not connected to this concept. The study is therefore mainly based on conversations with artists. On the other hand, Astahovska notes that in some cases performances and happenings became the source material for photographers who created their own independent photographic work. Ieva Astahovska, ‘Reclaiming the Invisible Past of Eastern Europe’, Interview by Zane Zajanckauska, \textit{MAP—Media | Archive | Performance} (e-journal), [accessed 12/11/2015].

\textsuperscript{682} Bojana Kunst. 2015. \textit{Artist at Work, Proximity of Art and Capitalism} (Zero Books), 62-63.

bodies or materials, to create new intersubjective spaces. Why it is, then, that performance art has been identified with immateriality?

As new materialist philosopher and physicist Karen Barad notes, matter ‘is figured as passive and immutable or at best inherits a potential for change derivatively from language and culture’.\(^{684}\) Immateriality then would align with the active and mutable, qualities that have been attributed to performance art since its very emergence. Yet, as Barad maintains, ‘matter is neither fixed and given nor the mere end result of different processes. Matter is produced and productive, generated and generative. Matter is agentive, not a fixed essence or property of things’.\(^{685}\) In addition, the document, which has absorbed the body’s materiality, has been identified as something inanimate and dead. However, the boundary between animate beings and inanimate objects has become obscure. This boundary is ‘more the result of an optical illusion than objective reality’, claims the geneticist Albert Jacquard, who illustrated the expanded category of life as the tendency of matter to mimic. This way, he identified life and liveness with the capacity to copy, which is inherent in humans, animals, plants and even rocks. ‘Thus life is newly (or again) a capacity of all matter, and the category “live” (and its analogs “vital”, “animate”) opens to everything, but perhaps most especially to matter formerly understood as inert, passive, or lacking in agency’.\(^{686}\) As Amelia Jones has aptly noted, new materialist theory allows us to question ‘the opposition between subject and object and the idea of the artwork as a fixed endpoint (of making) or as a fixed beginning point (of interpretation)’ and also

revise the notion of the artwork as bridge in order to articulate (or ‘discursively materialize,’ in Barad’s terms) the artwork along with the work of its having been made. In so doing we foreground as well the work of interpretation and come to a new level of understanding of how art’s materialities come to mean and to be valued.\(^{687}\)

To return the matter of historicisation, it is a fact that in Greece, as in Eastern Europe, performance art emerged and evolved on the margin of state-subsidised institutions. Being ignored, or even suppressed, by the main state institutions, such new forms of art grew in


\(^{685}\) Ibid., 214.


marginal and alternative spaces such as non-profit art centres and commercial galleries in Greece, functioning also as exhibition spaces for new trends. In Eastern Europe in general, they also grew in student and youth centres or private apartments. Consequently, little documentation can be found in the repositories of state museums; the bulk of performance documents can only be acquired from the artists themselves, and it is usually of low technical quality.  

The Greek state institutions’ lack of interest in the collection and preservation of performance art documents led unavoidably to what art historian and curator Zdenka Badovinac has called ‘self-historicisation’. Badovinac defined the artistic process of self-historicisation in the catalogue for the exhibition Interrupted Histories (2006), which was realised at the Moderna Galerija in Ljubljana and explored the archiving strategies in the former Eastern Bloc. As she explains,

Because the local institutions that should have been systematizing neo-avant-garde art and its tradition either did not exist or were disdainful of such art, the artists themselves were forced to be their own art historians and archivists, a situation that still exists in some places today. Such self-historicisation includes the collecting and archiving of documents, whether of one’s own art actions, or, in certain spaces, of broader movements, ones that were usually marginalised by local politics and invisible in the international art context.

Although documentation is meant to reinforce performance art’s visibility, its mishandling contributes to the lack of the discourse crucial to its dissemination, visibility and the possibility for reinterpretation. As curator Christopher Bedford argues ‘There is no performance outside its discourse’. Bedford notes that ‘art history, art criticism, art practice, and even popular art journalism all participate in the extension and reproduction of performance art in the public sphere and are, therefore, in the absence of a conventional

---

“object”, as potent and performative as the originary work’.\textsuperscript{690} In the absence of both public archives and theoretical discourse in Greece, performance art’s invisibility was amplified while the artists themselves became the sole source of meaning for their own work since no else could undertake this task.

1.5 Documenting in the Digital Age: The Issue of (In)Visibility

Although the conditions of documenting and archiving performance art have changed since digitisation, the concept of self-historicisation remains pertinent. Twenty-first century performances are most often excessively photographed and video-recorded not only by professionals for archival or other reasons, but also by viewers and pretty much anyone present with a mobile phone. However, the proliferation of digital documents is as significant as their persistent dispersal across the multitudinous online platforms ranging from blogs to institutional pages. Notwithstanding the numerous live art archives founded worldwide in the last twenty years, there is still no performance or live art archive in Greece.\textsuperscript{691} During the years 2010 to 2013, a group of art historians, theorists and artists, including myself, took initiative to set up such an online archive, but the lack of funding eventually became an insurmountable obstacle: our efforts remain, to date, incomplete. The foundation of ISET in 2009, which functions as both an archive of contemporary art and an exhibition space, has been of great importance for the research and visibility of contemporary Greek art and, to some extent, for performance art as well. ISET runs an archive of contemporary art, namely a space of memory and document preservation, and additionally endorses the production of new artworks drawing on its archive. Up until 2016, the art historian and theorist Elpida Karaba has curated three exhibitions so far in which artists were invited to use the institute’s archival material and create new artworks based on the old material.\textsuperscript{692} In this way, histories of performance and other forms of art are foregrounded, reconstructed and expanded, provoking sometimes new and deeper understandings of the past. Locating works exclusively in the past can be problematic. Works can acquire new meaning in contemporary settings, no

\textsuperscript{690} Christopher Bedford, 2012. ‘The Viral Ontology of Performance’, Perform, Repeat, Record, Live Art in History (University of Chicago Press and Intellect), 77-78.
\textsuperscript{691} To name but a few live art archives: The Live Art Archives at the University of Bristol (UK), Performance Matters Archive (UK), The Routledge Performance Archive (UK), New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, Dorothy and Lewis B. Cullman Center (US), The European Live Art Archive based at Girona University (Spain), Sound Art and Performance Art Archive at the University of Castilla la Mancha (Spain), The Australian Video Art Archive (AVAA) in Australia.,
matter when they were originally made. So, ISET is not exclusively preoccupied with the past but also with constructing a contemporary setting for meaning making.

Now, documents of Greek performance art are often available on the internet through websites, blogs and databases created mostly by the artists themselves, but also by other art institutions and platforms. In some cases, DVDs with live performances are included in exhibition and festival catalogues. Indicatively, for the Performance Art Festival in Thessaloniki, the catalogues are accompanied by DVDs with photographic and video fragments of the performances. A tentative solution to the lack of a broadly organised infrastructure for encountering performance, the privately acquired catalogue and its digital material encourages private viewing, challenging the public character of much of this work.

As Boris Groys has noted, ‘Digitalisation would seem to allow the image to become independent of any kind of exhibition practice’ since digital images have ‘an ability to originate, to multiply, and to distribute themselves through the open fields of contemporary means of communication, such as the Internet or cell phone networks, immediately and anonymously, without any curatorial control’. Thus, the digital image is in fact ‘a strong image in the sense that it is not in need of any additional curatorial help to be exhibited, to be seen’. That would, or should, mean that performance art’s visibility is amplified by the unlimited distribution of the digital image, which in effect disengages performance from both its original site or time specificity and the exhibition confinements. However, Groys also suggests that ‘a strong image can be regarded as truly strong only if it can guarantee its own identity in time—otherwise we are dealing again with a weak image that is dependent on a specific space, the specific context of its presentation’. He goes on to suggest that ‘it is not so much the digital image itself as the image file that can be called strong, because the image file remains more or less identical through the process of its distribution’. It is certain that digitalisation helps the image’s reproduction, circulation and self-distribution, being ‘therefore the medicine that cures the image of its inherent passivity’. However, at the

---

693 To name but a few, the artists Leda Papaconstantinou and Thodoros have their own websites (http://www.ledapapaconstant.com/ and http://www.theodoros.net/index.htm) while Mary Zygouri is using the video sharing website Vimeo to upload performance videos (https://vimeo.com/user9515713/videos/all). Goethe Institute has also created the Art Up! platform on media art in Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey (http://www.goethe.de/ins/tr/lp/prj/art/enindex.htm). Not in Greece but elsewhere, DVDs are also available for sale. Bobby Baker for instance has launched a series of DVDs with her performances.


695 Ibid., 84.
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same time, ‘the digitalised image becomes even more infected with non-identity—with the necessity of presenting the image as dissimilar to itself, which means that supplementary curing of the image—its curating—becomes unavoidable’.698 Thus, the circulation of photographs and videos in the chaotic digital space of the internet may provide artists and their work with further visibility and researchers with easily accessible material—in contrast to the time consuming and sometimes frustrating hunting of documents in private archives. However, additional procedures are required to turn transitory visibility into a sustained one.

Digitalisation has also turned the document into what Hito Steyerl has called the ‘poor image’:

The poor image is a copy in motion. Its quality is bad, its resolution substandard. As it accelerates, it deteriorates. It is a ghost of an image, a preview, a thumbnail, an errant idea, an itinerant image distributed for free, squeezed through slow digital connections, compressed, reproduced, ripped, remixed, as well as copied and pasted into other channels of distribution.699

Yet, this is not necessarily a defect. It is because of the poor image that an increasing number of rare materials and works of avant-garde, essayistic and non-commercial cinema, including a great number of old performances, have reappeared on publicly accessible platforms and have been resurrected as poor images. Some of them, like UbuWeb, are carefully curated, while some others, like YouTube, are just a pile of stuff. But why are they ‘poor images’ if they in fact contribute to the dissemination and enrichment of knowledge? As Steyerl explains, ‘poor images are poor because they are not assigned any value within the class society of images—their status as illicit or degraded grants them exemption from its criteria. Their lack of resolution attests to their appropriation and displacement’.700 Yet, the poor image ‘constructs anonymous global networks’, ‘creates a shared history’, ‘builds alliances as it travels, provokes translation or mistranslation, and creates new publics and debates’. But most importantly, ‘by losing its visual substance [the poor image] recovers some of its

698 Ibid., 87.
700 Ibid.
political punch and creates a new aura around it’ that ‘is no longer based on the permanence of the original, but on the transience of the copy’.\footnote{Ibid.}

The transience of the copy and the question of (in)visibility have been addressed by a group of artists and academics in the public project Visibility. Conceived and curated by Maria Paschalidou, participant artists and academics also included Nikos Bubaris, Yiannis Christakos, Marianna Nikolaou, Maria Nymfiadi, Constantinos Papadoukas, Zoi Pappa, Lea Petrou, George Tserionis and Adonis Volanakis. The participants worked on the production of the joint DVD that was the art product to be distributed. They all contributed works addressing visibility and communication. Copies of the DVD were exchanged for any products or ‘goods’ people were willing to offer during a public performance which took place in the farmer’s market of Attiki Square in the autumn of 2007. The public performance as well as the conversations and dialogues between the artists and the people in the market were video recorded and broadcast live both in an exhibition space and on the internet through live streaming. The stall with the exchange goods was then used as an installation at Cheap Art Gallery.\footnote{Maria Paschalidou, ‘On Visibility and Exchange: Visibility, a Public Action by Artists in the Attiki Square Street Market’, in Syrago Tsiara and Domna Gounari. 2008. From Bazaar to Hamam, Art Outside [Conference Proceedings—19.01.08. Warehouse B1—Port] (State Museum of Contemporary Art), 70-77.}

Before proceeding to the matter of (in)visibility raised and addressed by the project, two other important issues are to be discussed. The artists’ occupation of a stall in the street market alludes to the surrealists and later the situationists’ flea market jaunts guided by the spirit of the Baudelairean flaneur.\footnote{Ian Walker. 2002. City Gorged with Dreams: Surrealism and Documentary Photography in Interwar Paris (Manchester University Press).} The situationists wandered in flea markets either to discover second-rate canvases which they modified in various ways giving the paintings a second life (as Asger Jorn and John Heartfield did) or to practice derives—‘a wandering, improviser flow of acts, encounters, and images’.\footnote{On the situationist’s practice of everyday life see Neil Cummings and Marysia Lewandowska. 2006. ‘A Shadow of Marx’ in Amelia Jones (ed.), A Companion to Contemporary Art since 1945 (Blackwell Publishing), 410-415, 411(quotation). About Asger Jorn and John Heartfield’s paintings see Claire Gilman. 2004. ‘Asger Jorn’s Avant-Garde Archives in Tom McDonough (ed.) Guy Debord and the Situationist International: Texts and Documents (MIT Press): 189-212.} In flea markets, a logic of reimagined uses is at work; it often offers ‘a means of producing different kinds of value’ since the commodity economy is somewhat subverted through secondary purchases.\footnote{Cummings and Lewandowska, 2006, 410-411. See also Sadie Plant. 1992. The Most Radical Gesture: The Situationist International in Postmodern Age (Routledge).} It is well known that the situationists proposed (perhaps naively) a society in which pleasure would
replace profit, dissolving the antagonism between labour and pleasure through the abolition of money, commodity production, wage labour, classes, private property and the control of the state.\textsuperscript{706} Although the street market where \textit{Visibility} was partly realised was not exactly a flea market, the artists embraced and fostered the situationists’ ambitions: the abolition of art as a separate sphere of life and its integration into the everyday life not only of the bourgeois but of the working-class as well (this integration has been an [unfulfilled] aspiration of performance art since its very emergence) and the subversion of capitalist manners of production through the endorsement of barter economy based on exchange of goods and services.

A few years after the realisation of the project, barter economy enjoyed resurgence in Greece as a means of coping with the financial crisis and the unemployment, economic insecurity and exploitation it brought. A rising number of Greeks, particularly in rural areas have resorted to swapping goods and services in cashless transactions. Especially after the bank shutdown in 2015 and the imposed capital controls which remain enforced up to today (2017), hundreds of barter networks have sprung up across Greece in an effort to create an alternative to cash. Yet such behaviour is not encountered as a revolutionary praxis but rather as ‘a thing of the past’, reminiscent of the Nazi occupation when it appeared on a large scale; therefore, it is something we ‘shouldn’t aspire to’.\textsuperscript{707} Such a stance towards an exchange economy is again indicative of what has been suggested in Chapter 1 in relation to the public protests in Greece: protesters and citizens do not actually demand anti-capitalist revolutionary change, civil freedoms and direct democracy, but a return to the usual and familiar conformism of the pre-crisis past. Michael Shapiro explains that exchange has always been connected to both ontological and practical functions. Based on Georg Simmel’s suggestion that barter systems were part of a string of intersubjective relationships through which persons identified themselves and connected or bonded with their communities, Shapiro suggests that because

‘interdependence of personality and material relationships, which is typical of the barter economy, is dissolved by the money economy,’ it is not surprising that people’s ontological anxieties are evoked in response to

\textsuperscript{706} Ibtd., 412.
changes in the warrants for the value of money, not only because their wealth is at stake but also because they want their exchanges connected to a foundation with collective symbolic guarantees.\(^{708}\)

Although it is difficult to calculate the extent of the barter economy growing in Greece and around the globe, online forums and anecdotal evidence suggest that it is rising. Local exchange trading systems (LETS), which are not direct barter but are still full-fledged exchange or monetary systems exist now in many countries.

To return to the project, *Visibility* was intended to function on two parallel registers, addressing the invisibility of both the practice of performance and the specific neighbourhood’s population. Moving away from the safe environment of an exhibition space, the group wished to address broader audiences, assumed to be less familiar or indeed unfamiliar with contemporary art.\(^{709}\) Attiki Square is a central Athens district notable for its mix of communities and cultures. The local residents, consisting of Greeks but also many immigrants, were invited to participate in one of the pieces for the DVD and in the public performance by exchanging something they owned for the DVD and conversing with the artists and academics.

---

**Figures 5.5–5.3:** Maria Paschalidou (curator), *Visibility*, 2007, Public Act/ Performance/ Installation, Farmer’s Market of Attiki Square, Athens.

---


There was great interest in the ‘product’ the group offered; traders paused from their own work to go to the stall and offer some of their own products, and people who had heard about the project in the press or on the radio and arrived to participate. In the presentation of the project during the conference *From Bazaar to Hamam: Art Outside* (2008), Paschalidou noted,

> What we are dealing in at the street market is not the artistic product but the desire to communicate our work to the largest possible audience and the possibility of becoming visible... My intention is to relocate the artist from the closed space of the gallery and museum, into the public space, and to bring the public into the exhibition space.\(^{710}\)

The fact that the artist emphasises the group’s intention to take art outside the common exhibition site and approach a different public than the one that visits museum and galleries, namely the usual middle-class audience, through their ‘intrusion’ in a working-class space is suggestive of two facts. First, the artist(s) might have been unaware of the great number of performative artistic actions realised in Greek public spaces since the 1970s. The aforementioned conference took place in 2008, making it one of the first conferences in Greece about art outside the museum; this indicates a huge gap in Greek art history and research and justifies the possible unawareness of a history of public performance art in Greece. Second, the typical audience of art remains a bourgeois one, a fact which in turn denotes that performance art has indeed failed to bring the working-class into the museum by intervening in working-class spaces.\(^{711}\)

The document in this case is being digitalised and circulated in a public space, the farmer’s market, through the artists’ initiative. Visibility, though, can be a tricky concept. When do artworks and therefore artists become visible? Do they become visible simply through circulation of any type? Furthermore, what are the ramifications of temporary visibility that does not become permanent? There are probably thousands of performance documents hidden in private archives, storage rooms, hard discs and internet spaces worldwide that may

---

\(^{710}\) Ibid., 75-76.

\(^{711}\) It is interesting to note that according to a UK survey, conducted by Goldsmiths University and the arts organisation Create, it is the middle class that also dominate the creative industries (at least in the UK) pointing that ‘the lack of diversity means the arts is becoming the preserve of the rich’. See Hannah Ellis-Petersen, ‘Middle Class People Dominate Arts, Survey Finds’, *The Guardian* (23 November 2015), [https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/nov/23/middle-class-people-dominate-arts-survey-finds](https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/nov/23/middle-class-people-dominate-arts-survey-finds) [accessed 12/1/2017].
never become visible. The document and therefore the artwork and the artist become visible when they enter art history, and to achieve that, they must be shown and seen by those who will later present, curate, analyse, critique and archive them, thereby making them visible by giving them a place within the art world. As mentioned above and explicitly shown in Chapter 2, a great number of performances have been realised in public spaces in Greece in the presence of diverse publics; their temporary visibility, though, was sabotaged by their ephemeral nature. This nature can only be subverted (at least within Greek borders) not through mere production of documents, but through proper circulation and disclosure of those documents.

2. You Had to Be There, or Maybe Not?

2.1 The Question of Liveness: To Think, to Feel, to Imagine

The relation between performance, document and archive has only recently been addressed by a handful of art scholars in Greece. However, at least some art history academics at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (until 2008) have been convicted that a history of Greek performance art cannot be written because it is impossible for a researcher to examine or understand the performances of the past without having been there. Such a conservative opinion cannot but be, at least partly, related to the fact that although the University of Athens was founded (in 1837) at a time when the humanities were progressing in European countries, the study of art history developed extremely late. Thus, while history, archaeology, folklore studies and literature acquired their structure within Greek universities at about the same time as in other European institutions, art history remained sidelined and unexplored. This was mainly for two reasons: a) the decline of the tradition of Byzantine art (no large public orders took place for about four centuries), and b) the newly founded, state-established ‘official’ academic art (academic realism) replicating the forms and themes European art. Modern Greek art, therefore, has its point zero start around 1840, whereas art history has been taught in the Greek universities since the mid 1960s in Thessaloniki, early 1980s in Athens and later in Ioannina and Crete (more specifically, Greek art after the interwar period [1923–1940] was not taught in the School of Philosophy in Athens until 1991). Likewise, up

712 In 2008 I was personally discouraged from conducting the present research by one of the art history professors in Aristotle University of Thessaloniki on the grounds that I had not attended the performances of the previous decades and I should not examine art that is currently taking place. Of course it should be noted that this is not the case for all academics in Greece.
until the early 2000s, art history conferences with prolific exchanges of knowledge were extremely rare.\textsuperscript{713}

The extremely conservative tradition of art history in Greece has possibly been the most debilitating factor in the study of performance art, imposing for many years the ‘rule’ of a required chronological distance between research and its object. Art theorist and artist Kostis Stafylakis suggests that Greek art historians’ silence about the ‘now’ is often related to opportunism and reluctance of assuming responsibility for authoring Greek art’s histories: ‘Let’s not take the risk to talk about contemporary examples and let’s wait for the “invisible hand” of history to “reveal” or “bury” them’.\textsuperscript{714} In addition, at least in relation to performance art, the limited production of theoretical discourse, which exist usually through curatorial texts, was—and still is to some extent—often restricted to mere description of artworks and presentation of the artists’ intentions; it therefore remained uncritical, untheorised, and unable to open up new ways of interpreting artworks and writing art histories.\textsuperscript{715} The conviction that an art historian should not be ‘allowed to’ conduct research focused on living artists and therefore examine either the past or the present of Greek performance art has resulted both in extremely limited instances of critical contextualization of the subject and the endemic dispersal of documentation, rendering research on performance art acutely problematic, if not suppressed.\textsuperscript{716}

The problematic and yet intriguing relationship between performance art and its documentation has been, however, controversial in Western art history and performance theory for a long time. Performance scholars have been divided between those who contend that unmediated presence and contact or interaction between artist and viewer are constituent elements of performance art (and therefore being there is essential to grasp its meaning) and those who argue that the residues of a performance are equally, if not more, crucial for its apprehension.

\textsuperscript{713} See Adonis Kotidis. ‘Οι Περιπέτειες της Ιστορίας της Τέχνης’ [The Adventures of Art History], To Vima (17 September 2000).
\textsuperscript{715} It is worth noting that when I was hired by the Greek ArtNewspaper in 2006 to write about exhibitions, artists and Art Schools I was specifically asked not to be critical but descriptive.
\textsuperscript{716} Dimitrakaki has commented in her PhD thesis Gender, Geographies, Representation: Women, Painting and the Body in Britain and Greece, 1970-1990 (2000, University of Reading) on the incidences of ‘raised eyebrows’ that accompanied the question “are you allowed to undertake research focusing on living artists?” as a standard response of Greek art historians when doctoral students, including herself, sought to explain the nature and focus of their research (p.304). Although the above information is anecdotal, it is important for an understanding of the conservative tradition of art history in Greece.
In 1993, Peggy Phelan suggested that ‘performance’s only life is in the present. Performance cannot be saved, recorded, documented, or otherwise participate in the circulation of representations of representations: once it does so, it becomes something other than performance’. Phelan’s ideas concerning the ontology of disappearance in relation to performance have been most widely influential in performance studies. The literature on performance art has been dominated by an emphasis on the original event and the undervaluation of documentation. The controversy possibly emerged after Amelia Jones’s provocative and widely cited article ‘“Presence” in Absentia: Experiencing Performance as Documentation’ published in 1997, where she argues that ‘the specificity of knowledges gained from participating in a live performance... should not be privileged over the specificity of knowledges that develop in relation to the documentary traces of such an event’. She argues that this is because, while the experience of watching an artist perform is different from that of viewing or reading documents, neither experience has ‘a privileged relationship to the historical “truth”’. Jones builds her argument through the analysis of Carolee Schneemann’s Interior Scroll (1975), Yayoi Kusama’s Self Portrait (1962) and Annie Sprinkle’s Public Cervix Announcement from Post Post Porn Modernist (1990–1993). In using Derrida’s concept of the supplement, Jones argues that although she was present at Sprinkle’s performance, she is equally able to produce meaning for all the performances through their documents, since having been there does not give her any ‘special access to its meaning’.

Stressing that claims of presence and authenticity are extremely common in most writing on performance art, Jones quotes (among others) artist and art critic Catherine Elwes who argued in 1985 that performance art ‘offers women a unique vehicle for making that direct unmediated access [to the audience]. Performance is about the “real-life” presence of the artist... She is both signifier and that which is signified. Nothing stands between spectator and performer’. In contrast to Elwes’ suggestion, Jones contends that ‘there is no possibility of an unmediated relationship to any kind of cultural product, including body art’ and that the desire for immediacy is ‘a modernist dream’ that ‘must be viewed as historically specific rather than epistemologically secure’.

---
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Some years later, Elwes, in her response to Jones’ position, argued that experiencing a performance live provides an insight that cannot be reclaimed through documentation. She thus designates corporeal experience as the ultimate source of knowledge. Corporeal experience stands in contrast to experiencing performance through documentation which presupposes a reinvention of the work through the ‘detritus of the live event’; the historian invests such detritus ‘with whatever narratives most appeal to her or are currently advantageous to her career strategies’. Elwes reiterates here, perhaps unintentionally, what Peggy Phelan had already discussed in 1993: that ‘the labour to write about (and thus to “preserve”) it is also a labour that fundamentally alters the event’. Phelan does not maintain, however, that performance critics should not write about performance ‘because of this inescapable transformation’; instead, she suggests that ‘the challenge raised by the ontological claims of performance for writing is to re-mark again the performative possibilities of writing itself’. Writing about performance art, even when experienced through documentation, is not inherently defective or ‘opportunistic’ as Elwes suggests. Instead, writing can be apprehended as a performative reinvention that has the potential to reveal invisible and unthought aspects of the performance, becoming itself therefore part of the documentation.

According to Elwes, ‘at a time when so much is made of the notion of an embodied response it should be obvious that, when looking at a documentary photograph or text, the best part of our senses is absent or distanced from the apprehension of the work. A kind of pared-down vision is at play but the registration of temperature, the senses of smell, taste, touch, hearing, and that illusive sixth sense that picks up ambience have to be reconstructed in the imagination rather than experienced somatically’ [emphasis added]. As she explains, experiencing the performance through documentation deprives the viewer from ‘the artist’s gestures and expressions, her breathing and the timbre of her voice’, the real ‘scale and motion’, the ‘eye contact and the mutual recognition that ensues’ and ‘the duration and its symbiotic function’. This is important since ‘for women performers, the ability to determine the length of the work and hold the element of surprise reverses the conventional power relation in which meaning is read on the surface of their bodies as opposed to being generated

---
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by their actions’. Elwes concludes her article with the assertion of her main argument that ‘as with so many things in life, when it comes to a live event, in order to properly understand what it was that happened you had to be there. The rest is more or less plausible conjecture’. Although Elwes elucidates the differences of the two experiences (live and mediated), the above statement seems problematic as it suggests that all art historians (and viewers) that have not witnessed a performance live are unable not only to ‘feel’ the performance but also to achieve a critical appraisal of it, and consequently of the genre on the whole—since they cannot ‘understand it’ properly. In addition, not being able to ‘properly understand’ what happened implies that there is a singular meaning or truth that can only be revealed to the participants of a live event, and moreover that such a meaning or knowledge will be similar if not identical for all attendees. Elwes’s argument that documentation is misleading, seems to reject some of post-structuralism’s key assumptions, including that it is necessary to use a variety of perspectives to create a multifaceted interpretation of a text, artwork or performance and that there is no absolute truth or fact but rather multiple readings and meanings. Consequently, this privileging of the initial moment ‘over its temporally extended effects’ which aligns with Phelan’s ontology of performance, might ‘disallow performance art from accruing meaning and value over time’. As art historian Fraser Ward has accurately suggested,

We have to allow that performance art does not only happen when and where it happens. And given the importance of its documentation, however flimsy that may be, especially in terms of the doubleness of experience, it is a viable claim that the afterlife of performance is as important as the initial moment, insofar as that is when and where its meaning unfold, and that is where it generates transformations of the audience that are not strictly event-reliant.

Arguably Elwes perceives performance as an ‘event’ or rather an ‘evental site’. For Alain Badiou, a site, ephemeral and transient, is ‘an ontological figure of the instant: it appears only

---
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728 As Philip Auslander notes, ‘The idea that performance documentation can mislead implies that there is a truth of the event against which the accuracy of its representations can be measured. But where is this truth located and how can it be accessed?’ Auslander, 2010. ‘Towards a Hermeneutics of Performance Art Documentation’ in J. Ekberg (ed.), *Kunsten a Falle: Lessons in the Art of Falling* (Preus Museum), 93.
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to disappear’, a definition which accords with the way both Elwes and Phelan define performance art.\textsuperscript{731} In \textit{Logics of the Worlds}, Badiou counters the dominant postmodern philosophies defined by the phrase ‘there are only bodies and languages’—for which he uses the term ‘democratic materialism’—with his ‘materialistic dialectic’, underscoring the existence and importance of truth in a world and suggesting that ‘there are only bodies and languages, except that there are truths’.\textsuperscript{732} The evental site encapsulates thus a truth situation, a place where the destruction of old worlds and the creation of new ones becomes possible. Such a site seems thus to share common characteristics with Elwes’ reading of the performance site, which is both revealing of a specific truth and the ground for the creation of a new communal and social space.

Some of Elwes’ arguments about the insufficiency of the documents had already been discussed by art historian Kathy O’Dell in 1997. O’Dell examines the haptic in relation to performance documentation and questions the value of knowledge gained through photographs of performance pieces because of its inescapable fragmentation. She maintains that even if the photographs are supplemented with text, ‘viewers have to use their \textit{imagination} quite vigorously to get at what all might have taken place in and around the split second picture’ [emphasis added].\textsuperscript{733} Consequently, O’Dell also questions the accuracy and truthfulness of performance art’s historicisation and considers it partly imaginary: ‘The history of performance art is one that flickers, one that causes the historian to shuttle back and forth between that which is seen and that which has to be imagined—between the invisible and the visible.’\textsuperscript{734} Elwes’ and O’Dell’s depreciation of performance documentation on the grounds that art historians and viewers have to activate their \textit{own} imagination to elicit or create meaning from the documents seems paradoxical since the stimulation of imagination is a process that takes place in both experiences—live and mediated. The definition of imagination in the \textit{Oxford English Dictionary} is:

\begin{quote}
The power or capacity to form internal images or ideas of objects and situations not actually present to the senses, including remembered objects
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{731} Alain Badiou [Translated by Alberto Toscano]. 2009. \textit{Logics of Worlds: Being and Event II} (Continuum), 369.


\textsuperscript{733} Kathy O’Dell. 1997. ‘Displacing the Haptic: Performance Art, the Photographic Document and the 1970s’, \textit{Performance Research} 2/1, 73. Nonetheless, in contrast to Elwes, O’Dell does not believe in ‘performance art’s capacity to encourage unmediated proximity to the performer’, 77.

\textsuperscript{734} Ibid., 74.
and situations, and those constructed by mentally combining or projecting images of previously experienced qualities, objects, and situations. Also (esp. in modern philosophy): the power or capacity by which the mind integrates sensory data in the process of perception.\textsuperscript{735}

While in contemporary cognitive psychology, research has heavily swayed towards the first part of the definition which concerns the ‘mentally combining’ factor and is the notion of imagination that Elwes and O’Dell refer to; imagination is not confined to the invisible or absent, but is in fact part of the process of perception. Cognitive theorist Etienne Pelaprat and psychologist Michael Cole argue that ‘imagination is fundamental to experiencing the world in the here and now’.\textsuperscript{736} As they explain,

Imagination is constitutive of human thought, and should neither be understood as a specialised mental faculty nor as the creation of unreal fantasies. The contents of the imagination, though taken from the world, are not entirely ‘of’ the world. Similarly, the contents of the imagination, though resolved within the individual, are not entirely ‘of’ the individual. And yet, or perhaps because of this, the process of imagination is crucial to constituting the world and thereby the mind and experience of the individual. Normal mental processes are not reducible to either culture, biology, or individual experience. There are fundamental ‘gaps’ that must be resolved for individuals to think or act in relation to the world. Resolving these gaps through image making constitutes the self and the world in the same process. It is inherent to the structure of human cognition and action.\textsuperscript{737}

Imagination’s close relation to understanding and judgement has also been exposed by political theorist Hannah Arendt. For Arendt, imagination generates the ability ‘to see things in their proper perspective, to be strong enough to put that which is too close at a certain distance so that we can see and understand it without bias and prejudice’.\textsuperscript{738} In other words,

\textsuperscript{735} Etienne Pelaprat and Michael Cole. 2011. ““Minding the Gap”: Imagination, Creativity and Human Cognition”, \textit{Integrative Physiological and Behavioural Science} 45/4, 398.
\textsuperscript{736} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{737} Ibid., 412.
imagination is for Arendt ‘the prerequisite of understanding’. Furthermore, Arendt suggests here that a certain distance is necessary to unbiased understanding; consequently, the production of meaning during the live performance disallows such distance. It should be noted though that the idea of an ‘unbiased’ understanding is rather problematic. Finally, Tania Zittoun and Alex Gillespie have examined the diverse meanings that philosophers, psychologists and social scientists have attributed to ‘imagination’ through the years, and have also suggested an understanding of imagination ‘as an intentional, creative and socio-political process’. The production of meaning is therefore a creative procedure that presupposes an intellectual process and stimulation of imagination in relation to sensory experience. Imagination is activated for the transition from sense to meaning. This transition, however, which may or may not take place in the encounter with all forms of art including performance. Moreover, productive imagination is anyhow required in the writing of all kinds of histories and not only art history. As historian John H. Plumb has argued, history as an intellectual process ‘requires imagination, creativity and empathy as well as observation as accurate as a scholar can make it’. Therefore imagination should not be considered as misleading and disconnected from reality but as a means to respond to reality, including the complex generation of meaning and feeling.

Thus, when and where does the production of meaning take place? Furthermore, in what ways is meaning related to affect? Jones identifies the production of meaning with an intellectual process taking place after the live performance through the available documents (which incidentally do not include solely photographs but texts and communication with the artists as well). Elwes, alternatively, identifies understanding and knowledge as sensory and somatic experiences and defines meaning as a collective but immediate process (‘Between us all, we created the meaning’) that takes place during the performance and is contingent upon the ambience, the encounter and the social interaction realised in the course of the live event. Nevertheless, all this alleged interaction, wakening of the senses and ‘existential connectedness’ that Elwes attributes to performance art cannot be taken for granted. As PhilipAuslander notes, ‘For an audience to share space with performers does not in itself guarantee any sort of intimacy, connection, or communication between performers and spectators.’ Being present in a performance is not always engaging and stimulating or communal; it may

739 Ibid., 20.
also be tedious, incomprehensible, or extremely private; presence and liveness cannot guarantee either engagement or apprehension.

In his seminal book *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* Pierre Bourdieu notes that ‘a work of art has meaning and interest only for someone who possesses the cultural competence, that is, the code, into which it is encoded.’ Aesthetic enjoyment presupposes the ‘familiarity with the internal logic of works’. A viewer that has not ‘learnt to adopt the adequate disposition’ stops at what Ervin Panofsky called the ‘sensible properties’ or at ‘the emotional resonances aroused by these properties’. The viewer can only move from ‘the primary stratum of the meaning we can grasp on the basis of our ordinary experience’ to the ‘stratum of secondary meanings’ when we are familiar with the concepts that transcend the sensible properties. Although in performance aesthetic enjoyment has been replaced by aesthetic experience and even though Panofsky is referring to the stylistic properties of the artworks in Renaissance, the ‘sensible properties’, namely the knowledge we perceive through our senses, is what Elwes and O’Dell consider crucial in the production of both primary and secondary meaning. Yet, according to Bourdieu, ‘the encounter with a work of art is not “love at first sight” as is generally supposed, and the act of empathy, *Einfühlung*, which is the art lover’s pleasure, presupposes an act of cognition, a decoding operation, which implies the implementation of a cognitive acquirement, a cultural code’. In other words, according to Bourdieu, emotional resonance is not enough to elicit empathy which does not pre-exist but follows the cognitive process.

Bourdieu’s study of culture-mediated power relations and the politics of museum audiences, as found in *Distinction*, was based on the findings of his and Alain Darbel’s earlier study of European art museum audiences, *The Love of Art* (published in French in 1969 and translated into English in 1990, it remains one of the most influential academic studies). Based on an extensive survey of several thousand museum visitors to a representative sampling of art museums in France, Italy, Poland, Greece, Spain and the Netherlands, Bourdieu and Darbel examined who has real access to cultural capital, is ‘allowed’ to partake in the consumption
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of art and is eligible to decipher it. Through classifying the visitors’ habits according to their class, education, income and occupation, the authors bring into sharp focus the hierarchical social relations which structure the practice of art appreciation.

For the authors, the fact that European museums were free did not erase the fact that it was also optional entry. The whole point of their study was to show that the choice to visit the museum could only be explained by agents’ social position; those with high levels of cultural capital who were most removed from the urgencies of material life were the most likely to make such a choice. On the other hand, those from the lower classes were highly unlikely to go, and when they did, their experience was more daunting or overwhelming Rather than fulfilling or rewarding. This is indicated, for Bourdieu and Darbel, by both the relative lack of visits from the working classes and the more modest amounts of time spent devoted to contemplating works during the act of deciphering.

Bourdieu’s results are far from being out of date. As mentioned above, it seems that the ‘exclusion’ of the working-class from the museum has not changed much, since artists still seek to approach audiences beyond the cultivated bourgeois in public spaces (such as farmer’s markets) instead of at institutional exhibition sites. Anyhow, it seems that bringing culture to the masses cannot be achieved either by improving the layout of the museum and establishing programmes of cultural democratisation or through the expansion of the visual arts in spaces outside the museum. The dissemination of art knowledge is intertwined with or even contingent upon cultural capital that is the product of complex processes that originate in the family and school.

While the above controversy among performance scholars (Phelan, Jones, Elwes, O’Dell) has centred around the (im)possibility of producing meaning, the latest discussions on performance art have turned the focus from meaning to feeling and affect. Theatre and performance scholar Erika Fischer-Lichte in her analysis of Abramović’s performance Lips of Thomas suggests that such a performance ‘vehemently resists the demands of hermeneutics aesthetics, which aims at understanding the work of art’.750 In the performance Abramović proceeds to a range of actions that result in the transgression of bodily boundaries: she consumes 1 kilo of honey and 1 litre of red wine, she breaks the wine glass with her hand, cuts a five-pointed star into her stomach with a razor blade, whips herself and eventually lies down on a cross made out of ice blocks. According to Fischer-Lichte, ‘in this case,

understanding the artist’s actions was less important than the experiences that she had while carrying them out and that were generated in the audience. In short, the transformation of the performance’s participants was pivotal. What Lichte suggests here as transformation is the spectators’ involvement in the performance through their decision to put an end to the artist’s ordeal by removing the ice blocks from underneath her: ‘The performance transformed the involved spectators into actors’. Such a decision was nevertheless taken only by few members of the audience while the rest remained distant as viewers.

Lichte shifts the focus from understanding or creating meaning to feeling, emotions and affects. Awe, shock, horror, disgust, nausea, fascination, curiosity, agony are just some of the sensations that, according to the writer, stirred the viewers’ intervention in the performance and prompt them to ‘rescue’ the artist from her suffering. Thus, for Lichte, ‘the central concern of the performance was not to understand but to experience it and to cope with these experiences, which could not be supplanted there and then by reflection.’ In her approach to performance art, Lichte prioritises emotion over meaning and sets the focus on how the stimulation of affects transforms the viewers into actors and co-subjects. She believes that purposeful efforts to understand performance can occur only after its ending. She also thinks, however, that such retrospective efforts to understand performance are unable to co-constitute the aesthetic experience and are problematic for two reasons: for one, they have to rely on memory—a complex and not necessarily reliable process for inferring and stabilising meaning. Secondly, any retrospective understanding ‘is based on linguistic expression whereas meanings generated during performance are largely extra-linguistic’. This ‘translation of experience into language’ leads to the production of an independent text which, in its turn, seeks to be understood. In a way Lichte agrees here with Phelan about the performativity of the art historian’s text and seems to discern two kinds of meaning: one that is generated only by the aesthetic experience which entails (or may entail, I would add) the arousal of sensations and emotions and can only occur during the live performance (something akin to Bourdieu’s ‘primary stratum of the meaning’), and a second one that is constructed afterwards and relates to hermeneutic aesthetics. She argues therefore that some performances, such as Lips of Thomas, ‘did not seek to be understood but experienced’—

751 Ibid.
752 Ibid., 12-13.
753 Ibid., 17.
754 Ibid., 158.
755 Ibid., 159-160.
they cannot be incorporated into the paradigm of hermeneutic aesthetics’. Lichte here, against Bourdieu, suggests that emotions and affects themselves create the performance’s meaning; the mediation of cognition is not therefore needed for the viewer to decode or reach empathy. Moreover, her approach would also mean that when performance fails to engender strong emotions and feelings, it is meaningless, which is certainly not the case. The absence of emotional empathy does not eradicate the possibility of reaching an intellectual level of understanding (intellectual empathy) as, according to Bertolt Brecht’s theory of Verfremdungseffekt, an audience emotionally alienated from the action, would be empowered on an intellectual level.

Although Lichte does not refer to performance documentation, she discusses liveness in the context of broadcast and argues that mediated performance ‘sever[s] the co-existence of production and reception’ and ‘invalidates the feedback loop’. These things are also true when performance is experienced through documentation. However, the fact that one cannot interact with the artist does not mean that it is more difficult or impossible for a mediated experience to generate similar emotions and meanings. As art historian Tracey Warr remarks, ‘Both the live act and the photograph can employ the empathy of the body but they do so differently’. She explains: ‘The acts of empathy and complicity with photographs are different. Empathy summoned by a photograph can be more concentrated because there is no distraction from the environment or the embarrassment of being in a group and wondering how to respond in conjunction with that group, but you also cannot intervene in a photograph. There is distance, detachment, voyeurism and empathy all at the same time’.

Queer theorist and art critic Jennifer Doyle in Hold It against Me (2013) also addresses the production of emotion in performance art and the difficulty viewers might have to generate meaning, discussing not only live performance art but photography and video as well through the work of Ron Athey, Aliza Shvarts, Thomas Eakins, James Luna, Carrie Mae Weems, and David Wojnarowicz. Doyle explores ideologies of emotion, and underlines the reluctance of art historians and critics to examine performance under the prism of feeling. She discusses the stimulation of emotions, feelings and affects as a reaction that is independent from
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meaning, suggesting that as ‘a poem can be hard to understand—actively so—and still be very good and very moving’, so can a performance.  

The relationship between cognition and emotion has been a controversial issue among thinkers in the Western intellectual tradition. While historically the two have been considered as separate, in the last decades several scientists have pointed to their interdependence. For instance, Robert Zajonc (1980) in a paper titled *Preferences Need No Inferences*, claimed that affect and cognition are processed independently and that affect has temporal priority over any kind of cognitive process. On the contrary, Gordon Bower argued that cognitive processes could be used to understand emotions. Justin Storbeck and Gerald L. Clore extended Bower’s conception to suggest that ‘cognitive processes are necessary for the processing, elicitation, and experience of emotions’.  

To return to the debate about liveness and mediation, Philip Auslander refutes the value of ‘liveness’ and the concepts of ‘magic’, ‘energy’ and ‘community’ that are supposedly revealed during the live performance and connect performers and spectators. He questions the creation of meaning as a collective process and, like Jones, rejects the claim that the live is real while the mediated is unreal since the latter is just as much a human experience as the live one. Auslander argues against the idea that live performance itself creates any sense of community among performers and spectators. Instead, he suggests that the nature of performance is founded on difference, separation, and fragmentation that exclude unity. He refers to the failed attempts by Jerzy Marian Grotowski and Augusto Boal to achieve such desired unity. He also questions the need for a spectator to be present in the same space with the performer to enjoy the experience of watching a performance, and ultimately concedes that live performance may only offer social prestige to the spectator who can boast about having been present at a live event, which carries the value of being memorable to
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764 Auslander, 2008, 64. In the Theatre of the Oppressed, the audience becomes ‘spect-actors’ in the sense of becoming active, namely they are intended to explore, analyse and transform the reality in which they are living. See Augusto Boal. 1993, *Theater of the Oppressed* (Theatre Communications Group). Jerzy Grotowski’s work also involved the exploration of the relationship between participant and spectator with the aim to eliminate the division between actor and audience creating a communion between the two. Actors therefore performed having the spectators on many sides while participants also performed in and around the spectators. See Jerzy Grotowski. 2002 [1968], *Towards a Poor Theatre* (Routledge).
peers. Live and mediated, Auslander concludes, are not ontological opposites, but rather cultural since historical contingencies define their opposition.\(^\text{765}\)

Although I agree with Auslander that mediatised performance may be equally interesting, important and meaningful as live performance, his insistence that there is absolutely no difference between the live and the mediated seems far-fetched. Apart from the experiential differences, what Auslander fails to acknowledge is the contingencies live events entail. As Phelan has accurately noted,

\begin{quote}
For me, live performance remains an interesting art form because it contains the possibility of both the actor and the spectator becoming transformed during the event’s unfolding. Of course, people can have significant and meaningful experiences of spectatorship watching film or streaming video and so on. But these experiences are less interesting to me because the spectator’s response cannot alter the pre-recorded or remotely transmitted performance, and in this fundamental sense, these representations are indifferent to the response of the other. In live performance, the potential for the event to be transformed by those participating in it makes it more exciting to me—this is precisely where the ‘liveness’ of live performance matters. Of course, a lot of live performance does not approach this potential at all, and of course many spectators and many actors are incapable of being open to it anyway. But this potential, this seductive promise of possibility of mutual transformation is extraordinarily important because this is the point where the aesthetic joins the ethical.\(^\text{766}\)
\end{quote}

In other words, performance art is an ongoing process being produced at the same time it is being exposed, displayed and consumed. Even if the performance has been planned to the last detail, the potential that it could become something else is present until the last moment of its actualisation. Experiencing performance through documentation eliminates that potential for both artist and viewers and severs the feedback loop, as Lichte pointed out. However, this does not mean that viewers will be unable to be affected or produce meaning; it only means that their reactions will not be able to affect the artist or alter the live performance event. In

\(^{765}\) Auslander, 2008, 64-68.

other words, the problem of experiencing performance through documentation is the non-
experience of a social event and its possible contradictions and failure.

That viewers experience positive and negative affects during a performance should not be
taken for granted, though. Weak or no emotional response is a third possibility that can also
generate meaning. In fact, to make indifference apparent can be important by itself. It is not
only empathy, but apathy as well that can define the character of performance as a social
event and can determine a meaning that might be negative but still of value. Indifference can
be suggestive of two possibilities: first, that the performance failed to raise the desired
contradictions and be an event that disrupts normative discourses, social norms and the
dominant symbolic order, as discussed in Chapter 2. Second, it may expose another type of
negative social relationship, social apathy.

2.2 Blurring the Boundaries between Live and Mediated

Technological progress has blurred the distinct limits between the notions of ‘live’ and
‘mediated’ since performances can now take place ‘live’ and be at the same time mediated
for another audience through live streaming. In many cases, artists (or actors/dancers in
performing arts) perform their pieces in museums, theatres, festivals, etc., while a second
wave of spectators can watch the online in their home or local theatres.\textsuperscript{767} In addition and
most interestingly, live streaming is not just a means to reach and attract a broader audience,
but has become itself a means of performance production and dissemination. A number of
platforms (UpStage, Visitors Studio, the Waterwheel Tap, MOOs and others) host
‘cyberperformances’ employing technologies such as chat applications and real time
collaborative software.\textsuperscript{768} Performance Room is a series of performances streamed live across
the world via Tate Modern’s website and YouTube channel, inaugurated in 2012. Each
performance is then archived and available to view online after the event. What is intriguing

\textsuperscript{767} For example the National Theatre’s project \textit{National Theatre Live} (2009) broadcasts the best of British
theatre live from the London stage to cinemas and other venues across the UK and around the world offering the
chance to a second mediated audience to watch the plays. The Athens Concert Hall (Megaron) has been
participating in the project transmitting UK theatrical performances for the Athenian audience. Many museums
and other institutions in the world also use free live streaming to broadcast conferences and other selected
events.

\textsuperscript{768} Cyberformance is a term coined by the net artist and curator Helen Varley Jamieson in 2000 to describe her
experiments in live performance with remote performers coming together in real time via free internet chat
applications. As she explains, ‘it came out of the need to find a word that avoided the polarisation of virtual and
real, and the need for a new term (rather than “online performance” or “virtual theatre”) for a new genre’. See
here, especially in relation to the discussion around performance art’s ontology, is that *Performance Room* is ‘a series of performances commissioned and conceived exclusively to be viewed online and the first artistic programme created purely for live web broadcast’. The primary site of the works is not in reality Tate Modern but a digital online performance space. The online viewers, who are the only audience of the performances, are invited to enter that space, while being physically present anywhere, and are encouraged to participate through chatting with other viewers via social media channels and asking questions to the artist or curators for the live Q&A following the performance. Although artists have been performing for the camera for many decades now, performing for a camera that not only captures but also distributes the ‘image’ at the moment it is being produced is utterly different. The artists in this case know that they are being watched, and they address a ‘live’ audience even if they cannot see it. They cannot stop the process, re-perform or choose what is to be seen as they might in a performance for the camera). The viewers, on the other hand, despite being ‘present’, remain unable to intervene in the performative process, but, at the same time, they might interact with other viewers while being ‘protected’ behind a screen.

Live streaming does not only offer remote audiences the chance to ‘attend’ a performance; it also enables performance artists to participate in exhibitions and festivals without having to be present. Three Greek artists, Angeliki Avgitidou, Alexandros Plomaritis and Hope participated in the 4th Performance Biennale in Chile (2012) with live performances through live streaming without being themselves in Chile. The visitors at the biennale could watch the performances projected on big screens while viewers from around the world could also watch the performance live (or recorded afterwards) online.

‘Liveness’ and ‘presence’ are not anymore strictly defined by physicality, and one does not necessarily presuppose the other. Rather, both these attributes of performance are found to be historically contingent and their meaning and significance can change due to technological...
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769 Capucine Perrot. 2014. ‘Here, I knew I was being watched’, Tate Etc. Issue 30 [http://www.tate.org.uk/context-comment/articles/here-i-knew-i-was-being-watched][accessed 3/3/2016].


771 Artist Emily Roydson notes: ‘The live audience is protected behind their computer screens, so they are free to react with impunity—they will not be held to account by other audience members if they yawn, walk out (switch off), or make abusive comments’, [http://www.tate.org.uk/context-comment/articles/here-i-knew-i-was-being-watched][accessed 30/8/2015].
developments. Liveness ‘can no longer be defined in terms of either the presence of living human beings before each other or physical and temporal relationships’. Nick Couldry proposes two new forms of liveness that he calls ‘online liveness’ and ‘group liveness’:

[O]nline liveness: social co-presence on a variety of scales from very small groups in chat rooms to huge international audiences for breaking news on major Web sites, all made possible by the Internet as an underlying infrastructure. . . . [G]roup liveness[. . .] the ‘liveness’ of a mobile group of friends who are in continuous contact via their mobile phones through calls and texting.

Likewise, while presence in live performance is most commonly defined as the temporal and spatial proximity between performer and viewers, digital media complicate this definition. Digital presence transcends physicality and is defined not by spatial but temporal proximity. In the specific context of networking and social media, ‘presence is increasingly defined by participation, rather than by shared physical or even temporal space’. The combination or synthesis of physical and digital presence then, may open up the possibility to create new hybrid and transitional spaces.

The above paradigms of digital spaces of performance action and disembodied or dislocated audience interaction denote that the act of viewing or experiencing a live performance has drastically changed as the concepts and roles of physical proximity, time, space and distance that formulate spectatorship have altered and acquired new meanings through the use of new media. However, what are the consequences of such a fragmented or disrupted bodily viewing experience? While the experience opens up new communicative and communal possibilities through direct texting and possibly more liberated communication among viewers (and in some cases artists) than co-presence in an exhibition space would permit, this communication is at the same time rather internalised and more private. The internet clearly

---

774 Nick Couldry, quoted in Auslander, 2012, 6.
provides worldwide information and opens up possibilities for alternative modes of interaction, but this may also mean that art itself is then experienced as mere information.\footnote{Boris Groys maintains that ‘on the internet there is not art or literature, but only information about art and literature, alongside other information about other fields of human activity’. 2016. \textit{In the Flow} (Verso), 174.}

Another issue raised by this different form of spectatorship is whether it eliminates or reinforces the gulf between performers and spectators. Spectatorship has been challenged since the beginning of the twentieth century in several ways. In most cases artists’ efforts concentrated on diminishing the distance between performer and viewer (as in the case of Boal and Grotowski discussed above, Richard Schechner’s ‘environmental theatre’, Allan Kaprow’s happenings or the most recent paradigm of immersive theatre). Or artists wished to provoke intense reactions from viewers (for instance, Filippo Marinetti’s ‘The Variety Theatre’ manifesto of 1913 advocated the ‘use of itching and sneezing powders, coating some of the auditorium seats with glue, [and] provoking fights and disturbances by selling the same seat to two or more people’). The most recent paradigms of participatory art and one-to-one performance disclose the artists’ wish to turn the viewers into co-producers or engage them in visceral experiences of physical proximity (Adrian Howell’s \textit{The Pleasure of Being: Washing, Feeding, Holding} and Kira O’Reilly’s \textit{Untitled Action for Bomb Shelter} are exemplary participatory performances of this tendency).\footnote{See Richard Schechner, 1994 [1973]. \textit{Environmental Theatre} (Applause). Michael Kirby. 1971. Futurist Performance (Dutton), 23. Susan Bennett. 2003 [1997] \textit{Theatre Audiences} (Routledge). On one-to-one performance see Rachel Zerihan. 2006. ‘Intimate Inter-actions: Returning to the Body in One to One Performance’, \textit{Body, Space, Technology Journal}, 6/1.} Thus, while artists have been striving for decades to abolish the distance between performer and viewer, this different form of spectatorship seems to hold the viewer in a distance (at least from the artist during the performance), despite the possibility of interaction through new media forms and technologies (these technologies seem, in fact, to enable spectators to engage more in mediation itself rather than in the performance). In other words, what this dislocated spectatorship seems to revive is the separation between the ‘stage’ and the ‘auditorium’, known in theatre studies as the ‘fourth wall’. In this case however, the wall is not invisible and imagined but rather evident, raising inevitably the visitors’ feeling of distance because of their remoteness from the physical site where the action takes place. Thus, while fast-paced modern communication through technology is embraced, the physical co-presence of performers and spectators is sidelined, repudiating the assumption that a performance can only come into being through the bodily encounter and interaction of performer and audience.
Such an evolution of spectatorship cannot but be connected to the broader imperatives of late capitalism that permeate every aspect of life. The endorsement of a network of disparate spectators who interact is indicative of what Jodi Dean has called ‘communicative capitalism’:

Communicative capitalism refers to the form of late capitalism in which values heralded as central to democracy materialise in networked communications technologies. Ideals of access, inclusion, discussion and participation are realised through expansions, intensifications and interconnections of global telecommunications. In communicative capitalism, capitalist productivity derives from its expropriation and exploitation of communicative processes. This... means that capitalism has subsumed communication such that communication does not provide a critical outside. Communication serves capital, whether in affective forms of care for producers and consumers, the mobilisation of sharing and expression as instruments for ‘human relations’ in the workplace, or contributions to ubiquitous media circuits.778

The rhetoric of interactivity cultivated in the art world since the early twentieth century but dominant since the 1990s has inevitably set the focus on sociability, as already discussed in previous chapters. Yet in the twentieth-first century, social media have become the technological mode of the social and a vital tool for artists. Accordingly, and as the above paradigms indicate, the social event of performance art has been transferred from the physical space to the digital one, a condition which has also brought a shift in the rules for the audience. Viewers are asked to volunteer their labour not under the direction of the artist (as it is common in participatory art) but through sharing information, chatting, expressing their views and posing questions through social media channels, participating in this way in the formulation of communication as capital. Although the notion of audience labour was initially suggested in relation to the political economy of communication in the era of print and electronic mass media, it constitutes a necessary concept for the political economy of digital communication as well. Every company that operates as a communicative capitalist by generating profit from payments for access to culture or by advertising revenue (and that is

most companies engaging in digital communication), is in effect exploiting audience labour. It seems therefore that ‘controlling and extracting value from audience activities—which is to say, activities of cultural consumption—is the primary way (though by no means the only way) in which communication is treated as capital in the digital era’. Finally, it would be interesting to investigate if these new worldwide online audiences are similar to the audiences of ordinary art spaces in terms of class, education, cultural capital, etc., or perhaps less closer to the heterogeneous and diverse audiences of social media.

3. Re-enactment and the Return of the Dead

The huge surge in interest and production of live art in Greece and elsewhere has brought into the foreground the latest trend in performance, namely the re-enactment of past performances and events. Over the last fifteen years or so, several art museums have restaged performances and dances, mainly from the 1960s and 1970s. Abramović’s retrospective exhibition at the MoMA in 2010 is possibly the best-known example of this tendency. During the exhibition, a number of her past performances were re-enacted, so that audiences could see them in addition to the documentation on display. A great number of artists re-performed Abramović’s and Ulay’s performances in an effort to preserve ‘liveness’ and defeat the ‘deadness’ and supposed passivity a document carries. ‘Not quite live, not quite dead, these re-enactments have introduced a zombie time into these institutions’, as Hal Foster has rightly noted.

In this ‘zombie time’ it may be difficult to differentiate life from


780 The term ‘re-enactment’ usually refers to live reconstructions of historic events, in the visual and performing arts framework it refers to both the redoing of past performance art pieces and the re-staging of political protests or events as the work of Jeremy Deller who re-staged the 1984 British miner strike in his 2001 Battle of Orgreave. The concept of re-enactment had its contemporary origins ‘as a self-conscious intention with Kaprow’s Activities, and later, beginning in 1988, in variations on 18 Happenings in 6 Parts (original 1959)’. Robert C. Morgan, ‘Thoughts on Re-performance, Experience and Archivism’, 12. Yoko Ono’s Cut Piece was enacted in Tokyo and New York in the mid 1960s; it has since been re-enacted by a number of younger artists, and by Ono herself in 2003 in Paris. In 2005, in Seven Easy Pieces, Abramović had re-enacted six major body art works from the 1970s at the Guggenheim Museum (New York) along with one of her own earlier works (Lips of Thomas). Also, in 2008 some of Allan Kaprow’s happenings were restaged during the retrospective Allan Kaprow: Art as Life at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles. See also The Performance Re-enactment Society, founded in 2007 by Bristol-based artists Paul Clarke, Tom Marshmann and Clare Thornton, http://performancereenactmentsociety.blogspot.gr/ and http://clarethornton.com/prs/ [both accessed 22/4/2017].

781 Philip Auslander has argued that documentation does not just generate images that describe a performance, instead it produces an event as a performance. See Auslander. 2006. ‘The Performativity of Performance Documentation’, PAJ , 84: 1-10.

death, presence from representation and live from documented, since all re-enactments are tied to the paradox of performing an act not of presence but rather of representation based on documents and bound to produce new ones.\textsuperscript{784} The performative in re-enactments does not in effect actualise but rather virtualises, offering a ‘spectral presence’ and making the viewers feel ‘a little spectral’ as well.\textsuperscript{785} The complications stemming from re-enactment do not only pertain to the problem of experience; they also touch upon issues of authorship and the performers’ appropriated labour. What does it mean for a performer to re-enact somebody else’s work? And how does this sort of labour relate to one’s personal work as performer?

The dominant conviction that through photography performance art becomes a mere memory, something finite of another era, is probably what drove major Greek art institutions and Greek artists to participate in the growing re-enactment trend. Dimitris Alithinos restaged his performance \textit{A Happening} (discussed in Chapter 1) twice in 2013; the first time was during his retrospective exhibition organised by the National Museum of Contemporary Art in Athens, and the second was at the State Museum of Contemporary Art in Thessaloniki within the framework of a tribute to his performative work realised during the fourth Performance Art Festival.\textsuperscript{786} In addition to the re-enactment, however, documentation of this and other performances was also displayed.

\textit{A Happening} was realised in 1973 at Ora Cultural Centre in Athens under extreme conditions of censorship imposed by the dictatorial military rule.\textsuperscript{787} Back then, the performance could be seen as an act of resistance and the viewers were well aware of the risk involved in participating in an action that would be deemed illegal by the colonels. The performance was extremely powerful and affective, and the audience’s response particularly intense and

\textsuperscript{784} As Hal Foster suggests ‘What is staged is less a historical performance than an image of the performance’, Foster, 2015, 129. On artistic re-enactments and their impossibility to produce presence see Amelia Jones. 2011. ‘‘The Artist is Present’’ Artistic Re-enactments and the Impossibility of Presence’, \textit{TDR: The Drama Review}. As Carrie Lambert-Beatty has suggested, ‘If you believe in the sacred authenticity of the original, then by definition no redo could threaten it; if you think performance is always already mediated, then live bodies are as much a form of representation as any other’, ‘Against Performance’, \textit{ArtForum} (May 2010): 208-213.

\textsuperscript{785} Foster, 2015, 130.

\textsuperscript{786} In 2010, during the MIR Festival, the artist had also presented an alteration of the performance in public spaces under the title \textit{Happenings 2010}. In different locations at the centre of Athens the artist ‘buried/concealed’ one performer each time (two at the Vegetable Market) under a pile of soil. See \textsc{MIRFESTIVALOG}, \url{http://www.mirfestival.gr/blog/index.php?sl=%CE%AD%CE%B4%CE%B1%CF%86%CE%BF%CF%82} [accessed 2/12/2016].

\textsuperscript{787} The artwork involved people trapped in white boxes out of which protruded moving limbs. In a corner, there was another box inside of which acid was dripping on a piece of metal, slowly destroying it, while one last box had a tiny hole similar to a telescope eye. Visitors to the show would spontaneously look through it and see themselves in a mirror. Passing through the boxes, visitors arrived at the familiar scene of a middle-class dining table. The performance is analysed in chapter one.
emotional because of both the dynamics of the performance and the circumstances of its actualisation. Although the performance relates to socio-political conditions today as well, foregrounding the increasing violence and the present rise of fascism not only in Greece, but in Europe and the US as well, the re-enactment failed to reproduce the original intense response. The new viewing conditions were utterly distinct from the initial ones. The framework of the festival, prestige of the national museum, broader institutionalisation of performance art and increased curiosity of audiences (by now familiar with all sorts of ‘peculiar acts’ performed by artists) stand in contrast to the imperative of resistance and defiance embedded in the 1973 performance and give the re-enactment the familiar qualities of ‘art as spectacle’. As Foster accurately points, ‘in re-enactments we are positioned as incidental witnesses to an event that could as readily occur without us’.

Abramović’s re-enactment of *Lips of Thomas* in 2005 was not exempted from this charge. While the initial performance had provoked the viewers’ intervention to protect the artist from harm, the re-enactment simply concluded at midnight with Abramović still on ice. As Frazer Ward explains, ‘the more formal and inherently spectacular setting of Guggenheim’s rotunda clearly contributed to the limitation of possible audience interventions (if anyone had tried to “rescue” Abramović, I am sure they would have been met by a security guard).’ What then becomes evident is the impossibility of a re-enactment to escape the discontents of the document, namely the impossibility of liveness, interaction and completeness. Re-enactment draws a clear line between ‘liveness’ and ‘physical presence’. It is indeed possible (and probable) that what the viewer encounters in re-enactment is the performer’s interpretation of what a performance piece already was based on documentation.

In a different context, seven artists—Dimitris Bampilis, Dimitra Billia, Gitsa Konstantoudaki, Martha Pasakopoulou, Eliane Roumie, Vassiliki Spachou and Kalliopi Zervoulakou—re-

---

788 The gallery would open at 9 am but people gathered outside an hour earlier while after the closure they would remain till midnight to have long discussions with the artist and each other. In an article in Kathimerini, Maria Karavia describes the performance as emotionally overwhelming, creating a truly intense atmosphere where people were discussing and crying. See chapter one.

789 In regard to the viewer’s reaction, having been present to both re-enactments I did not observe any particularly emotional responses by the viewers, at least in comparison to the ones described by the artist and Maria Karavia about the performance in 1973.

790 Foster, 2015, 130.


792 Ibid. Ward also mentions that there was a woman in the audience who called out in tears “You can stop. You don’t have to do this” while a male voice immediately answered ‘Yes she does’. Ward suggests that while the woman’s intervention suggests ‘an opening up toward community’, the answer “yes she does” ‘sees the ordeal of the performance and Abramović ‘s body as the spectacle of art, something exacerbated in the space of the Guggenheim’. Ibid., 114.
enacted Abramović’s *Art Must Be Beautiful, Artist Must Be Beautiful* (1975) and *Cleaning the Mirror* (1995) in 2016 during the project *As One* realised in Athens (10 March to 24 April 2016). *As One* was organised by NEON, a non-profit arts organisation founded in 2013 by major contemporary art collector and leading Greek industrialist Dimitris Daskalopoulos, in collaboration with the Marina Abramović Institute (MAI).793

The artists involved were quite young and came from diverse fields, including theatre, dance and visual arts. Zervoulakou, for instance, is an art student (born in 1993) who has also participated as interpreter in Tino Sehgal’s *This Progress*.794 There is little doubt that after 2000, we are witnessing the emergence of a generation of artists who, instead of presenting their own performances, perform the work of leading and widely discussed ‘international’ artists. This trend should not be conflated with performances in the 1960s and 1970s in which emerging or already established artists performed ‘works from the past’ as in the well-known example of Carolee Schneemann performing *Édouard Manet’s Olympia* in Robert Morris’s *Site* (1964), which certainly did not take place under Manet’s direction.795 In her retrospective in MoMA, Abramović hired thirty-six young artists, again coming from diverse fields, to re-perform five of her historical pieces of the 1970s, being rotated in specific shifts during the three-month exhibition. In the Dimitria Festival in Thessaloniki in 2016, a great number of performers and musicians (whose names were never mentioned in the press releases) re-performed Yoko Ono’s *Cut Piece* and *Sky Piece to Jesus Christ*. The question which inevitably arises is whether these artists are deployed acting like re-enactors, trying to follow instructions and directions from the original performer, or whether they are encouraged to interpret the performance in their own way, transforming it into something new. As Carrie Lambert-Beatty puts it, ‘More interesting than whether re-enactments are art-historically correct is what they are asked to do—whether they close down or open up the potentiality of performance’.796 If the intention is to produce a clone of the original performance, since a second original would be impossible, then I would say that the artists are merely re-enacting rather than performing. Then again, when considering the performers’ inadequate pay for demanding labour and the problematic conditions under which they are often asked to work,

793 NEON, as stated on its website ‘works to bring contemporary culture closer to everyone’ and ‘is committed to broadening the appreciation, understanding, and creation of contemporary art in Greece and to the firm belief that this is a key tool for growth and development’. See http://neon.org.gr/en/about/ [accessed 18/8/2016]. In regard to the MAI see http://www.mai-hudson.org/ [accessed 18/8/16].


one could suggest that the performers are not treated either as artists or re-enactors. The well-known conflict between two ‘matrons’ of performance, Abramović and Yvonne Rainer in 2011 regarding the exploitative working conditions of the performers hired for a reconstruction of Abramović’s *Nude with Skeleton* and other performative actions under Abramović’s supervision and guidance at the Los Angeles Museum Gala is, as Bojana Kunst has noted, representative of the fact that the production of subjectivity and its exploitation lies at the core of contemporary culture, while the status of the performer’s work and the loss of their voice can be directly associated with the changes of work in contemporary capitalism.

In fact, this loss of voice ‘also underlies the problematic loss of the critical and political power of performance art; this loss is not a consequence of appropriation by institutions that are supposed to make spectacles out of performance pieces, but of a basic shift in the power and force of subjectivity’.

The project *As One* was manifold and encompassing. Apart from the re-enactments were the famous Abramović method, lectures, film, workshops and new performances by Greek artists produced under the guidance of Abramović herself. Specifically, the programme included long-duration performances by six Greek artists, who performed for eight hours per day for seven weeks, and twenty-one performances presented as ‘performance interventions’ by eighteen Greek and five foreign artists. The project was a great success, at least in numbers. As noted on NEON’s website,

> Almost 50,000 people visited the Benaki Museum, mainly young people, full of passion for new experiences. About 9.500 people felt the need to describe what they experienced and write down their impressions on the AS ONE visitor’s book. In total, 2,680 hours of performance were realised by 29 artists who were surpassing the limits of their minds and bodies for

---

797 As three performers, Abigail Levine, Gary Lai and Rebecca Brooks explain, ‘leading up to the Abramović retrospective in 2010, the 39 “reperformers” engaged in a series of successful negotiations with the MoMA for better wages and working conditions. The initial offer we received from the museum struck many of us as untenable: $50 for a 2 1/2 hour performance shift, no compensation for prep time or time in between shifts, and, most troublingly, no workman’s compensation, which would cover us in the case of injury. Through a first round of negotiations, we achieved a modest pay increase and a change of status to “temporary employee,” which provided us workman’s compensation and some other benefits. However, we were only able to approach a fair wage for our work after two fainting performers made evident the difficulty and risk of our work. Still, we were not paid enough to avoid working other jobs during the run of the exhibit.’ See ‘Three Reperformers from “Marina Abramović: The Artist is Present” Respond to the MOCA Gala Performances’, *The Performance Club*, http://theperformanceclub.org/2011/11/three-reperformers-from-marina-abramovic-the-artist-is-present-respond-to-the-moca-gala-performances/ [accessed 30/8/2016]. See also Bojana Kunst. 2015. *Artist at Work* (Zero Books), 37-49.

798 Kunst, 2015, 37-43.

799 Ibid., 43.
8 hours a day. 26 talks & 16 workshops by 29 artists and people related to different cultural sections took place, about the history of performance and its relation to other forms of art. The publicity of the project was relevant to its importance in Greece as well as internationally, with descriptions and hands on editors’ experiences. The interest of international press to cover the project was high with at least 10 extensive articles by international press such as The New York Times, Bloomberg, CNN Style, NZZ Am Sonntag, Forbes.com, Art Monthly, ArtNet, ArtInfo, Wallpaper* online, Calvert Journal. In Greece, newspapers, sites and magazines covered AS ONE with more than 600 articles.\textsuperscript{800}

A number of issues are reflected in the project’s success. First of all, it is evident that the Greek audience has developed a great interest in performance art over the years. Such a development certainly relates to the inclusion of performance art as a distinct genre in the programme of at least one university (the university of Western Macedonia in Florina since 2007), the increase in performance art festivals and related exhibitions, the general surge of interest in live art and the ‘mainstreamisation’ of performance art. However, the impressive success of As One in terms of audience attendance must also have been related to the \textit{de facto} superiority of the high profile of the alleged guru of performance art Abramović, since none of the other performance art festivals realised in the previous ten years ever achieved such high attendance and publicity. Despite her origins in Yugoslavia, Abramović is seen as a leading representative of performance in the West, and at least in Greece, Western art centres maintain their hegemonic role in the history of performance at large.

4. Resisting the Image, Expanding the Document

4.1 Resisting Representation and Reproduction

As mentioned in the first part of the chapter, it is since 2000 that some artists have consciously chosen to resist the production or exhibition of visual and other documentation of their work. An exemplary case of such a stance towards documentation is the artist Tino Sehgal, who refuses to document his ephemeral constructed situations and prohibits all forms

of recording during performance. Tania Bruguera, on the other hand, does not reject the production, but only the exhibition of documentation representative of her piece *Tatlin’s Whisper #5*. She sets specific conditions for curators wishing to display the performance:

The curators and exhibition organisers do not have the right to show the resulting documentation of the piece (including interviews to the participants or the curators) as a substitution of the work nor as a companion material during the exhibition of the work. The documentation will never be shown instead of the work. The public view of the archive will be done solely for an exhibition surveying forms of documentation or archives in which case the piece has to be performed and the horse and mounted police exhibited live in the space, in addition of the archival material on display.

Clearly both artists place a premium on immediacy and foreground the production of live experience against representation through documentation. In this way, the artists ‘declare’ that the only way to see the work is to experience it first hand. The prohibition of documents activates, however, the dissemination of the works through rumour and the writings of art professionals: ‘The refusal of mediasation thus becomes mediagenic’. The publicity machine of the museums, biennales and other art institutions make sure to communicate appropriately Sehgal’s ephemeral, constructed situations and, as art historian Sven Lütticken remarks, the ‘radical ban on reproduction creates a spectacle of absence’. Here lies the difference with the possible undocumented performances of the early 1960s. The purposefully undocumented performances of the 2010s are highly visible within the art world—often in the context of highly visible art institutions of international and even global purchase. The purposeful refusal of (conventional) documentation creates both a novelty feature for such institutions as much as it legitimises their support. In this context, documentation is replaced by publicity,


802 See Tania Bruguera, ‘Conditions for showing *Tatlin’s Whisper*’ [accessed11/11/2015]. During the performance, two mounted policemen in uniform are brought into the museum or exhibition space to patrol the space, guiding and controlling the audience by using crowd control techniques. These include actions such as closing off the gallery entrance or entrances, pushing the audience forward with lateral movements of the horses, manipulating the audience into a single group and encircling it to tighten the group, frontal confrontation with the horse, and breaking up the audience into two distinct groups.

setting in motion a complex machine of mediation (participants, critics, scholars) that enables the circulation of the work while the latter also becomes part of the involved art institution’s own history. In this way, art historians, scholars, reporters and bloggers become themselves the documenters of such performances and make possible their afterlife. Moreover, the refusal to document, at least in Sehgal’s case, does not relate to an anti-market or anti-capitalist ideology, as it is claimed for the performances of the 1960s. Rather, the refusal to document relates to an anti-materialist, ecological ideology and the belief that visual documentation is not able to capture the experience since it is only a secondary representation of it: ‘Photographs are two-dimensional, I work in four dimensions’, Sehgal notes.  

4.2 Documenting through ‘Confessions’

Although such an attitude towards documentation has not been adopted by Greek performance artists, Georgia Sagri attempted the replacement of visual documents with oral ones in her project Confession in 2005; instead of producing images, Sagri produced narratives about the performance. Confession was a project realised in a series of interrelated steps. The first of six steps was the process of finding six individuals (three women and three men) to be the viewers of a one-to-one performance. The second step was the performance itself which, according to the artist, was exactly the same for all the participants, each of whom watched it separately and on different days. The content of the performance was never revealed by the artist herself nor documented through photographs or video. In the third stage of the process, the participants, after the end of the performance, were transferred to another studio where they were asked to answer three questions: ‘What did you see, what happened? Did you participate? How did you feel?’ Their answers were recorded and six videos were produced. In the fourth step, the artist drew four realistic sketches depicting objects that had been used during the performance. In the fifth step, six art critics, historians and theorists (again three women and three men) were invited to discuss the work. Their discussion was based on the material from four out of the six videos with the viewers and a brief summary of the project concept without any description of the performance. Their discussion was also recorded. The sixth step was the exhibition itself presented at Gazon Rouge Gallery (April and May 2005) in which the public could watch the six videos with the interviews and see the

four sketches branded as ‘photographs’. The performance was never revealed to anyone else but the six viewers/participants. The final stage of the process was the release of a publication that includes an elaborate account of the six steps. Specifically, the book offers a record of the six narrations of the participants, their photographs—without any further information related to their identity—the sketches and a written transcript from the discussion among the art professionals.

Through the six descriptions of the performance one cannot form a clear idea of what exactly happened in the room with the artist. Most of the viewers seem to have a rather blurry idea about the artist’s action and their narrations focus on how rather than what they experienced. Thus, drawing upon the six ‘confessions’ one can only understand that the performance was realised in a dark room where the artist was walking around mumbling some words sometimes addressing the viewer. Some viewers felt the artist was searching for something whilst others thought she wanted to show them something. Regarding their participation, three of them said they did not participate at all while the others seemed more sceptical saying that at some point they participated in a way or at least they tried to. In the question ‘How did you feel?’ some viewers expressed thoughts rather than feelings, referring to what they understood but without making clear sense. For instance, one of the viewers said ‘I was alone when the performance started. I felt a bit surprised and then I tried to understand the sort of meanings she was getting at. Then, I think, she gave me, she tried in a cleverly crafted psychological way to give a very strange end, which in my opinion should have been more impressive than what I had expected’. Only one talked about feelings of awkwardness that were later transformed into some sort of intimacy and personal contact, while some others referred to their effort to concentrate on what was happening so as to make some meaning and identify with the artist. It seems that is was difficult for them to express/reveal feelings without having produced some meaning first, a fact which corroborates that cognitive processes precede emotional arousal and when ‘meaning’ is hard to establish it becomes also difficult to produce ‘feeling’ as well.

In the fifth step of the project the six art professionals were asked to discuss about the performance based on the narrations of four out of six viewers. After having watched the

---

806 Sagri, 2006, 25.
807 The six participants were Antonis Bogadakis (art theorist and coordinator of the conversation), Denys Zacharopoulos (art historian and critic), Xenia Kalpaktsoglou (curator, director DESTE Foundation),...
videos, the art professionals recognised among the viewers the well-known theatre director Yannis Houvardas and a psychiatrist (without mentioning his name) and identified the other two viewers as ‘a little girl with broken Greek’ and ‘a working-class lady’. Unavoidably, some characteristics of the viewers’ identity were anyway disclosed through their answers. The vocabulary they used to describe their experience, their approach to the subject matter and the connections they made or not make reveal at least that some of them were familiar with contemporary performance art practices while others were not at all.

Finding it difficult to define the performance and understand exactly what happened solely through the oral testimonies/narrations, the art professionals’ discussion quickly diverged from the performance itself and expanded to issues relating to the artist’s intentions in terms of the entire project and not solely the performance such as her criteria for selecting the viewers, the viewers’ identities and their influence on the development of the project. They also touched upon the relation between performance, documentation and artwork, noting that video documentation of a performance is not the artwork itself but a mere document necessary to transmit the performance experience to more people than the ones who witnessed it. They also tried to draw a distinction between the notions of documentation, testimony and recording, suggesting that ‘documentation is somehow a choice within the context of recording’ and that the recording in this case is testimony and not documentation.

Although it would be impossible to report here the entire—often chaotic—discussion, what is certain is that the discussion did not develop around Sagri’s performance but rather around the whole project as a performative process and an experiment in which they became participants. But what conclusions could be drawn from such an experiment? The most apparent one would perhaps be that without any visual documentation the witnesses’ testimonies were not sufficient for reconstructing the performance as such. Visual—and better, audiovisual—documentation might seem therefore indispensable for the writing of performance art histories. Yet, instead of considering testimonies as something other than documentation, I would suggest that they be seen as a component of documentation. In fact, the viewers’ experience as a piece of documentation is not necessarily more elusive than a

Augustinos Zenakos (journalist, art critic), Giorgos Tzirtzilakis (architect, curator), Polina Kosmadaki (art historian), Dspoina Zeykili (journalist, art critic).

808 Zacharopoulos in Sagri, 2006, 57. The other two viewers were the art historian Pepi Rigopoulou and a man whose identity remains unknown.

809 Zenakos in Sagri, 2006, 60.

single photograph or video would be. In other words, if instead of the testimonies one could see a photograph of a small dark room where the artist is in some sort of movement and the viewer is sitting/standing across her, the information about the performance would still be considered insufficient since it would be impossible to understand what happened without talking to the artist or the witnesses. The inclusion of both visual and oral documentation though could have provided a better understanding of the performance. Moreover, through the expansion of the document and the foregrounding of the viewers, the project also touches upon issues related to the reception of live performance art, stressing in a way that the production of meaning and/or feeling should not be necessarily attached to the condition of liveness since most of the witnesses did not exactly understand what happened. Finally, it is important to consider the intentions behind the production of documentation. If the aim is to offer a clear depiction of the artist’s action, then it failed to do so in this case. Yet, if the aim is to represent the viewer’s experience it succeeded since the narrations transmit accurately the bewilderment of the viewers and their difficulty to attach an unambiguous/explicit meaning or feeling to the action.

The rejection of ‘the visual’ in favour of an alternative testimonial form of documentation had also intrigued performance artist Marilyn Arsem in the 1990s. *Red in Woods* was an installation—performance designed for individual viewers. It was realised in a snow-filled woods at dusk, for six different people, during the winters of 1991–1993. The artist drove herself the viewers to the specific and gave them instructions: ‘This is RED IN WOODS, it involves all your senses and takes place a full 360º, both near and far. You may engage with it in any way you wish. Just follow the red yarn path. You will know when it is over. And be careful’. The path followed a winding route through the woods, field and swamp that was about half a mile long. Along the way there were a great number of settings, objects and performers with which the viewer could engage. In this case too, each viewer was alone with the work. No one witnessed the event together with that person, and no one was watching as s/he was engaging with the piece. The only records of the event are separate interviews with the six people, in which they described their experience. As the artist notes: ‘The interviews reveal the range of interpretations that an audience can have of essentially the same event. Each person’s understanding of the performance was unique, coloured by her or his own.

concerns, undiluted by anyone else's perspective'. In a similar mood, in 2011, the collective JocJonJosch realised the performance *Existere* at TestBed1, an experimental art space in south London and decided not to document the performance photographically, ‘preferring to engage with its mnemonic and imagined remnants’. Writers and artists were invited to contribute impressions, essays or artworks, in the hope that these would provide an alternative form of documentation to the photographic image. Almost a year after the performance, a book which sought to engage with the ideas raised by the performance (questions of eroticism, corporeality, collectivity and memory) was published and a conversation was held at the Institution of Contemporary Arts in London. The participants were Jo Melvin (curator, art historian), David Gothard (theatre director), John James (poet and collector), Rye Dag Holmboe (writer and PhD candidate) and the aim was to situate some of JocJonJosch’s strategies within the broader context of performance art, particularly in relation to the problems encountered in its documentation.

What is common in the three performances/projects is the transposition from visual to experiential documentation. While visual documentation of a performance is always developing around the artist’s action, the testimonial/experiential document sets the focus on the viewers’ understanding, feeling and experience opening up perhaps new possibilities for alternative representations and interpretations. The viewers, after having become participants and co-producers of the artwork, acquire this way a new role; they are asked to document and, in a way, evaluate not only the performance, but their own experience as well. They are therefore compelled to invest more labour in their encounter with art and contribute to the production of meaning through the articulation of their experience, thoughts and feelings. What *Confession* and the other projects suggest is that documentation, apart from performative can also be in a sense ‘live’; a suggestion that lies in complete accord with the mania for current experience and liveness within the art world, including in Greece.

---

814 Ibid.
3.3 Documenting the Unseen

The twenty-first century has been characterised by a dramatic rise not only in participatory and one-to-one performances but also in immersive performances. Although virtual reality is hardly a new phenomenon, its inclusion in the practice of performance art/theatre has been quite popular since the beginning of the twenty-first century and new terms such as ‘multisensory performance’ and ‘immersive theatre’ have been used to describe such work. In these practices, the viewers are again transformed into co-actors and co-creators and, in some cases, they are invited to experience a parallel reality through their immersion in virtuality. Their experience then becomes holistic rather than visual. Consequently, in such practices the usual visual document meets a new particularity; it cannot actually represent the performance because the real action takes place in the viewer’s imagination and not in the actual space. But let me explain what I mean.

I am going to examine two examples of immersive performance and discuss the questions they raise in relation to the document and its use. In 2012, the Swedish artist duo Christer Lundahl and Martina Seitl presented their innovative work Symphony of a Missing Room at the Acropolis Museum in Athens. The artists, who have presented the specific work in many museums in Europe since 2009, were invited by the art historian and artistic director of MIR Festival, Christiana Galanopoulou, to participate with the specific work in the festival. As stated by Galanopoulou, it was the first time that a work of contemporary art was presented among the collection of the Acropolis museum, and it took great effort to convince the director of the museum to agree to the realisation of the project.

---

816 Immersive theatre also refers to theatre that uses architectural interiors: ‘extensive environments which audiences explore in order to find the performance, and sometimes to give performances themselves’. Shunt and Punchdrunk, as examples of such immersive theatre. See Gareth White. 2012. ‘On Immersive Theatre’, Theatre Research International, 37/3: 221–235. See also Josephine Machon’s (Syn)aesthetics: Redefining Visceral Performance (2009) and Immersive Theatres. Intimacy and Immediacy in Contemporary Performance (2013). A Greek example of such immersive theatre is Fake Time at Hotel Ariston performed in Thessaloniki in 2012-2014. A group of young artists and students, Giannis Sotiriou, Katerina Zura, Vassilis Lazaridis, Lela Ramoglou, Stratis Tavlaridis, designed and built the sets for the interactive performance which was realised in an empty and abandoned seven-floor Bauhaus hotel. The forty-two vacant rooms of the hotel were transformed in seven different worlds: 1st floor psychiatric clinic, 2nd floor cityscape and police, 3rd floor a forest, 4th introspection in the life of the protagonist, 5th floor fallen royalty, 6th floor secret closet. Twenty-five actors participated in various short and recurring events sometimes interacting physically and verbally with the viewers. See http://cargocollective.com/stratistavlaridis/Fake-time-7-floors-at-Hotel-Ariston [accessed 5/3/2016].


818 The information about the procedure was given to the author by Christiana Galanopoulou in a discussion in regard to the specific artwork on 32/11/2012.
The performance, a collaboration with designer Jula Reindell, was actualised for a small number of visitors each time. The work is, in a way, a guided museum tour during which the participants depart on a seemingly collective but, in reality, extremely personal journey. Wearing white-out goggles and wireless headphones the participants are led by a voice and the subtle touch of some performers, on a tour that unfolds through the physical but also imaginary architecture of the museum. With the use of multi-sensory illusions and binaural sound recordings their attention escapes away from the visible and tangible world and is diverted into a new and immaterial perception of space, time and possibly self, as the artists claim. The narratives of the performance are based on the collections and architectures of each museum and aim to stimulate and engage the participants’ imagination:

*Symphony* explores the idea of the museum as an observer and keeper of history. But history is proposed here as a kind of ‘backwards prophesying’: as one must call into the imagination an event that someone tells you will happen, one must similarly imagine an event you are told once did happen. The visitors are led by the hand of an unseen guide while a voice gives them instructions. For instance, one of the instructions is to crouch down as if they were going to be led into a tunnel. The instruction combined with the three-dimensional sound pointing to a narrow, low tunnel create ‘the inner image’ of this place in the viewers’ mind. The image is then reinforced by the movement of the body (crouching down) which is feeding back stimuli to the mind, building up the image of the low, narrow corridor to extend to the visitor’s body. As the artists note, the experience is so embodied that many visitors have said they also felt the smell of dampness and mould, which was not there.

---

820 Ibid.
821 Lundahl and Seitle/ Johan Poussette ‘The Viewer as Medium’, *Imagining the Audience*, 97. See also an interview with the artists by J.Machon, *Immersive Theatres*: 171-187, 178.
While the performance is constructed and directed by the artists, it is actualised in the participants’ imagination/mind. The viewers are ‘sensorially deprived and controlled in a very precise way throughout the whole experience’, yet strangely they describe a feeling of increased freedom. As Lundahl suggests, ‘the freedom comes from the increased capacity of perception that they can give to the experience, rather than to the part of themselves that is steering them through space’. 822 Lundahl and Seitl suggest this way new forms of exhibiting and perceiving art unsettling the traditional way of looking at art in a museum.

The complex interactive potential of the digital technologies of our time were also explored by the Greek artist Yiannis Melanitis in his project Blind Date, a multi-user choreographic environment presented at the Monaco Dance Forum in 2002.823 The visitors had the chance to experience two places at once, mixing again physicality and virtuality. In the artist’s words:


823 Apart from Yannis Melanitis, the choreographer/performer Isabel Valverde, the musician/composer Vassilios Kokkas and the Java Programmer Nikitas M.Sgouros also worked for the specific project.
‘Two persons meet/date in a room completely blind to one another other if not for two avatars of themselves seen through their VR glasses manipulated by two computer users. The glasses function as an intermediate apparatus between the participants’ “free motion” and control.’

The visitors’ goggles did not just deprive them of sight this time; two avatars, one for each participant engaged them into dance movements. While the dualist framework of vision/mind and touch/body was activated here as in Symphony, placing the viewer between two realities, in this case the participants’ responses ‘ranged from feeling totally strict in terms of following the avatar’s movement, to using it loosely as suggestions to move from as they wished’.

Figures 5.5-5.6: Yiannis Melanitis, Pleasure Machine 2/Blind Date, 2002, Participatory/Immersive Performance, Monaco Dance Forum, Monaco.

Arguably, the new artistic methodologies employed by artists propose new modes of experience and therefore require new ways of documenting. The emphasis placed on objective physical presence—defined as the temporal and spatial proximity between performer and viewer—by performance artists of the previous century is replaced by the emphasis on a subjective sense of embodied presence. Intersubjectivity is subsequently being replaced by personal/individual immersion and self-consciousness. ‘Derived from the Latin immergere, meaning to plunge or dip into, immersion in digital culture refers to the sensory experience/perception of being submerged (being present) in an electronically mediated
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824 Ioannis Melanitis’s Website, [http://www.sculpture.asfa.gr/melanitis/blinddate.html](http://www.sculpture.asfa.gr/melanitis/blinddate.html) [accessed 20/7/2016].
Instead of looking at an image from the two dimensional perspective, the participants/viewers, are now able to see from within the image. Instead of watching or becoming part of the constructed reality of a performance, they are now invited to construct their own reality in terms of a performance through virtuality.

By detaching ‘the visual’ from the performance, the visual document is inevitably rendered ineffective since it reveals what the viewers did not see. The above photographs of Symphony and Blind Date depict the participants moving and dancing respectively in the ‘objective’ space of the museum or festival. Yet, these photographs, as documents, can actually disclose nothing from the participant’s experience, be it traveling to another time and space or dancing with an avatar. It is not by chance that the artists use the viewers’ accounts when they are asked about their work. The narratives of the participants’ experience appear to be the only way to document such practices.

While the activation of imagination in the reinvention of performance has been considered by some scholars as misleading, as discussed earlier, what is common in all the above case studies is the intentional employment of imagination as a means of performance reconstruction. While Sehgal and Bruguera refuse to exhibit any form of documentation as representative of their constructed situations and performances, they cannot control the entire production of documentation; since there is a participant audience, the performance circulates through modes of oral and textual documentation. The use of imagination is automatically required then to a secondary audience (like myself) that did not experience the work in person but wish to understand it. Sagri rejects the exhibition of the traditional visual document and invites first the art professionals and then the visitors of the gallery to recreate her performance in their imagination through the oral ‘confessions’. Finally, in the case of immersive performances, imagination, though guided and therefore partly confined, is fostered/suggested as the work in itself. The triggering of imagination through virtual reality is a controversial issue though since the viewers, in order to participate, have to surrender
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826 Kurt Vanhoutte and Nele Wynant. 2010. ‘Node: Modes of Experience’, Mapping Intermediality in Performance (Amsterdam University Press), 47. The history of immersive theatre could be traced back to avant-garde experiments like expanded cinema, in Artaud’s total theatre and Richard Schechner’s environmental theatre.

827 Ibid.
their freedom to the ‘machine’, accept its rules and follow its logic. Imaginative capacities might therefore be reduced ‘in favor of functional skills… and instrumental thinking’.

The paradigms of performance art discussed in this section resist becoming an image and instead they foreground a usually dismissed aspect of documentation, the recording of the participants’ memories of the event. If performance art is first and foremost valued for its liveness and the potential interaction with an audience that is present at the specific place the specific time, wouldn’t it be paradoxical to utterly ignore/dismiss their opinion? Although such a record could only be kept just after the performance’s ending (as it would be quite difficult to detect witnesses of a performance afterwards) and it would require the audience’s willingness to contribute, the conjunction of the visual, the textual and the testimonial documentation of performance art could provide diverse perspectives of the experience and knowledge of the performance not only for the subsequent viewers and researchers but also for those who have experienced it live. The viewers/participants’ observations, thoughts and feelings could reveal hidden aspects of a performance. For instance, in the case of Maria Karavela’s work (examined in Chapter 1) a member of the audience revealed her presence and action in her environment while the visitors book in Dimitris Alithinos’ performance *The Happening* disclosed that while audiences may be homogeneous in terms of class, they are not in terms of politics since the audience comprised both left wing viewers and people in support of the authoritarian regime. The study of audience testimonies could contribute to an understanding of who constitutes performance art audiences and expose how these audiences experience live performance and what affects their interaction with artists and other viewers. As Jennifer Radbourne, Hilary Glow and Katya Johanson acknowledge in the introduction to *The Audience Experience: A Critical Analysis of Audiences in the Performing Arts*, investigation into how audiences experience live performance is still relatively rare. A new kind of audience research that will ask the question ‘What are audiences thinking, feeling and doing as a product of their engagement with arts practices?’ is therefore necessary to fill the gap in understanding what participant-viewers get out of performative encounters with art. Such research would also be valuable with regard to the community-based projects discussed
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828 Günter Berghaus makes these comments referring to virtual reality video games and their effect on a child’s cognitive development, interactive behavior and communicative competence. I find his remarks though pertinent to immersive virtual performances as well. 2005. *Avant-Garde Performance. Live Events and Electronic Technologies* (Palgrave Macmillan), 246.


830 Ibid., xiv. It should be noted though that the specific publication is referring to audiences of performing arts and not performative practices within visual art.
in the previous chapter. It would contribute to the nuanced consideration of the projects’
effect on the participants and shed light on their feelings and thoughts about their
participation. The interest in alternative and dialogical modes of documentation through the
inclusion of both critical writing and the public’s opinion was also expressed in We Need to
Talk about Live Art, a collaborative ‘flash publication’ of critical responses to the 2008
National Review of Live Art (Tramway, Glasgow). The project developed in dialogical
mode; apart from the texts produced by five writers, comment cards were made available to
the viewers and the feedback was incorporated into the daily publications which were
distributed as photocopied handouts to festival attendees in addition to being available
online.831

5. Performance Art within the Art Market and the Performer’s Labour

5.1 Performance and Performer as Commodity

Already in 1973, Lucy Lippard pointed out that conceptual art would not be exempt from
general commercialisation by the art market even though a few years earlier, in 1969, she
thought that no one would be willing to spend money on the residues of conceptual art,
including photographs documenting an event or performance.832 Time has proven that the
market’s mechanisms cannot be thwarted for long; eventually they incorporate anything that
might have intended to escape. Yet, despite the fact that all forms of art eventually become
sellable in capitalist societies, and although it might seem that performance art has been
utterly integrated within the art market in the same way as more conventional practices, it still
remains in the margins of the art market globally.

Several famous artists have been selling their performance documentation in auctions, and
photographs of performances of the 1960s and 1970s are now being sold in auction houses
and galleries.833 The prices of the photographs or videos can reach the prices of the

831 We Need To Talk About Live Art was part of the larger Writing from Live Art initiative that began in 2006, a
scheme ‘supporting writers to become established commentators on Live Art in the arts and mainstream press
trough writing that is critical but accessible seeking to engage new audiences through articles, reviews and
833 One can find a variety of performative photographic documentation of performances on sale on the Artnet:
conventional art forms. According to Abramović’s dealer Sean Kelly, prints of photographs coming from the artist’s performances are sold from $25,000 to $500,000. Yet, compared with other artists who enjoy the same level of fame, such as Damien Hirst and Jeff Koons, only a few of her works have made it to an auction. On the other hand, in most cases the documents are considered to be ‘copies’ of something original, that is the live performance that once took place, and as copies they can thus be sold to more than one buyers, in contrast to an object-based piece of art.

Nonetheless, this is the case for the few well-known performance artists whose name, in some cases, seems to have been built up as a brand. For the majority of performance artists, the documentation of their work remains to a great extent unsellable since the object based forms of art are still dominant within the art market. Specifically, the two thirds of all artworks circulating in the art market are paintings while the remaining third consists of photographs, sculpture and prints. Video, performance and other conceptual practices account for less than 1% of the market, according to the art historian and expert on the international art market Noah Horowitz. Notwithstanding the upsurge of performance art and its broad acceptance and praise by art institutions throughout the past decade, the genre of ‘disappearing’ art has not been equally treasured by the art market and collectors. Having said that, it becomes obvious that performance art generates income for a very small number of artists while the majority of artists are forced to find other means to support themselves. As Julieta Aranda, Brian Kuan Wood and Anton Vidokle note, it is frustrating that artists are usually obliged to have two or three different professions that are, unlike that of art, ‘respected by society in terms of compensation and general usefulness’ not only to be able to support themselves financially but also to be able to practice and present their art work.

After all, art is neither a religion nor a charity and this idea of art labour as free labour must


836 Noah Horowitz, ‘Talk at the London School of Economics in 2012’, found in Rebecca LaMarre, ‘Selling the Unsellable: the Contemporary Art Market’, Royal College of Art: FUELrca (14/11/2012), [accessed 3/1/2016]. Horowitz also mentions that not a single work of the top 50 most expensive artworks sold in 2009 was video-based.

be contested. Worse is the case for Greek performance artists—not only because of the financial crisis (ongoing since 2009), but also because of the absence of infrastructure; grants, funding and residencies have always been extremely limited if not non-existent. It is common for Greek artists and art professionals in general to succumb to unpaid work, which they include in their CVs to indicate their willingness to work, their experience and versatility. This usually results in the accumulation of experience and other unpaid jobs.

Although since 2000 some commercial Greek galleries and collectors have expressed interest in performative practices, performance art has not been substantially integrated into the Greek art market. To take one example, the Greek lawyer and collector Leonidas Beltsios has supported the genre by including in his collection documentation of performances by several Greek artists such as Georgia Sagri, Evangelia Basdekis, Yorgos Sapountzis, Fani Sofologi and others. Some Greek performance artists are now represented by galleries in Greece and abroad that promote their work through photographs and videos; others are not at all interested in selling the residue of their performances. Most of the Greek artists discussed in this thesis have sold documentation (photographs and video) of few performances, while some others have never sold a single piece; some of them are not interested in selling, while others find it difficult to do so within the Greek or other art markets. Apart from selling documentation or performances as ephemeral actions, celebrity artists are sometimes commissioned to stage spectacular performances for specific events or galas for elite crowds. This is not the case in Greece, where performance artists mainly present their work
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838 Ibid.
839 NEON (a private and non-profit organisation founded in 2013) offers five grants of €8,000 each year to artists for performances and dance production, see http://neon.org.gr [accessed 15/4/2016].
840 Since April 2016, the State Museum of Contemporary Art in Thessaloniki in collaboration with the School of Journalism and Mass Communications of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki are carrying out for the first time a research on the living conditions of artists in Greece. Yet, the research has not brought any findings yet (that is up to April 2017). See http://www.cact.gr/news/cactsurvey [accessed 20/2/2017].
841 Despite the burgeoning art scene in Athens, the Recession has brought dramatic changes in the Greek art market which was anyhow unstable; Petros Vergos auctions were suspended for the first time since 1989 (year of foundation), the Greek sale of the British auction house Bonhams shrank while the Greek sale of the Sotheby's was discontinued. Several galleries closed while the purchasing power dropped to 20%. For further information see Ioanna Kleftogianni. 2013. "Έσκασε η Φούσκα στην Αγορά Τέχνης" [The Bubble in the Art Market Burst], Eleutherotypia (18 May) http://www.enet.gr/?i=news.el.article&id=364257 [accessed 24/3/2015].
in exhibitions, festivals and biennales that, in most cases, do not compensate them. Artists are only offered reimbursement for travel expenses and sometimes not even that.\(^{843}\)

The Greek Cypriot collector Dakis Joannou does not distinguish between performance and other media/practices despite the possible challenges that may arise as in the case of the purchase of Tino Sehgal’s *This Is Propaganda* (2002) for which Joannou must hire an actor to sing every time someone enters the room, if he ever wants to stage the performance.\(^{844}\) Sehgal, who rejects any tangible trace of the performance, as mentioned before, has launched new conditions for selling performative art. Instead of objects associated with actions, owners of Sehgal’s art possess ideas. The artist sells his performance art pieces through verbal transactions in the presence of a lawyer without any written contract or description of the piece. Collectors and institutions have strict orders never to photograph or video his performed situations while the instructions on how to stage his work are just given orally and exclusively by the artist.\(^{845}\)

Hence, it seems that although museums, curators and publics are increasingly attracted to performance/live art, collectors not only in Greece but internationally still remain distant from the genre, especially when this involves purchasing a set of instructions and not a document. The works are then logistically and conceptually demanding to stage and almost impossible to resell. Catherine Wood, a curator of performance art at the Tate notes that ‘it almost becomes a form of patronage, more than a purchase’—referring to the few private individuals and major institutions, such as the Tate in London, the Centre Pompidou in Paris and the MoMA in New York which are buying live performance—which indicates that ultimately it is a matter of prestige for the collector or institution to afford such ‘difficult’ work. According to Rose Lee Goldberg, when buying a performance piece (and not its documentation) ‘you are buying a relationship with the artist’.\(^{846}\) While performance artists in the golden age of capitalism during the 1960s and early 1970s used their body as art medium to produce immaterial art as resistance to commodification, half a century later

\(^{843}\) All information of this paragraph in relation to Greek performance artists is drawn from the numerous interviews I conducted with the artists throughout my research.


commodification has expanded not only to the immaterial but to the producing subject as well. According to Marxist political economy, a commodity is not necessarily a material object; it can be anything that is exchanged for money. Immaterial commodities such as services and their transformation into personalised performances is a development analysed by Italian opera scholars such as Paolo Virno and Antonio Negri in their work on post-Fordism and immaterial labour. In Marxist theory, the primary immaterial commodity was labour power: the amount of labour needed to produce an industrial commodity. Services are also commodities in which labour has been invested and the worker is paid a wage representative of the labour (or indeed labour power) required to do the job. First objects, then services, and now experiences have all entered the capitalist economy.

Museums and collectors are buying ‘relationships with artists’ and transform/translate them into experiences for the public. In a similar way employers are paying their employees to provide their services in a performative manner that will turn the service into an experience for the consumer. This way ‘the performative colonises labour’; the worker is expected to perform her/his best and unique qualities if s/he wants to keep the job. As Sven Lütticken remarks: ‘As anonymous services become performances, even abstract labour power has to be enacted in a personalised way by individual performers. This turns not only performance into a commodity, but ultimately the performer as well’.

The Greek paradigm is different so far. Buying a performance as a live event to be staged has not been adopted by the Greek museums of contemporary art which find hard to even afford photographic and video documentation of performance art. The visual documents they own have not been bought in most (if not all) cases but donated by the artists. Museums are not therefore buying artistic labour, they acquire it for free and they even make the artists feel grateful for having been selected. In a way, performance artists offer their services for free and are still expected to perform their best qualities not to upgrade their wage but to become visible. As Gregory Sholette points out, ‘even relatively successful artists must cope with constantly shifting employment, global transit (from biennial to fair to biennial), and tireless networking and self-promotion, which may be the real reason artists are hailed as the

849 Ibid., 194.
850 Ibid.
prototype of the knowledge proletariat’. The precarious existence of the performer and her/his impossibility to make a living out of her/his artistic labour is humorously designated in the project Performers Express discussed next.

---

5.2 Performance Delivery by Performers Xpress

The repulsion/discontent of the document versus the attraction of liveness, along with the perplexities of performance art’s economy and the labour conditions under which performance artists are forced to work, are humorously and yet sharply addressed in the project *Performers Xpress*. This work was carried out in 2014 by the artists Fotini Kalle and Angeliki Avgitidou, who attempted to promote and distribute performance art as not only a live experience, but also a specialised service to be ordered. The artists created a website on which they offer a performance menu and price list. The website outlines the terms and conditions under which the artists are willing to perform and invite the public to book a performance through the booking form so as to experience a performance suited to personal their choice wherever and whenever they wish. The menu consists of fifteen choices with a starting price of one euro for the categories of ‘memory’, ‘tools’, ‘time’ and ‘temperature’; the most expensive one is ‘tech’ at a cost of ten euros.852

[Image: Performers Xpress menu]

*Figure 5.7: Angeliki Avgitidou, Fotini Kalle, Performers Xpress, 2014, Website.*

The whole venture is imbued with a sense of humour that is rare for the Greek art scene parodying both the current obsession with ‘experience’—indeed, personal experience and

---

customised service—and the conditions of artistic labour, possibly exemplified in the case of performance art. Instead of looking for documentation of older performance art pieces, viewers can now easily experience a live one. Avgitidou notes that, as a performance artist, she is often asked at the last stages of an exhibition production to participate with a performance, ‘just to interlard it [the exhibition] with a live experience’. More often than not the invitation comes with no compensation at all, not even for covering travel expenses, as if there is no need for time or money to prepare a live performance because of its immateriality. On the other hand, Kalle underlines their intention to comment critically on the use of the term ‘performance’, now used to describe all sorts of events such as concerts, shows, advertising campaigns, etc. The notion of performance is often misinterpreted, and the work of performance artists is therefore undermined.

The institution’s demand for quick, unpaid, improvised work from the performance artist can only imply that performance art, despite its entrance in mainstream culture and institutions, has not gained the appreciation or respect that other genres of visual or performing arts have. What is in fact exposed here is that the perceived immateriality of performance, despite the presence of the labouring body (as discussed earlier), reveals the still dominant hierarchy between object-based art and non-object-based art. It is such a hierarchy that also dictates the demand for documentation as the condition under which ‘immaterial’, non-object-based art ‘enters the interconnected institutional spaces where culture circulates: funding agencies, museums, art schools, libraries, auction houses, private collections, publishers, and even the TV’. In other words, it is the materiality of the document (in contrast to the ostensible immateriality of livenesss) that allows performance art to enter the circles of economy and history.

It is important to note that this critique of performance as service appears in Greece in the 2010s, that is only during the ‘crisis’. That means that the current socio-economic conditions, as discussed in Chapter 1—the general crisis of labour, the widespread precarity, the vulnerability and exploitation of the working subject, as well as the major financial cuts in the already problematic cultural sector, have generated awareness of the conditions of artistic
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853 Angeliki Avgitidou, communication with the author, 14/02/2016.
854 Ibid.
855 Foteini Kalle, communication with the author, 14/02/2016.
production. Andrea Fraser, being herself involved in ‘project work’, which has been common mode of art production since the early 1990s, in her essay ‘How to Provide an Artistic Service: An Introduction’, argues that artists are ‘always already serving’ and that all ‘project work’ reveals in effect this condition in contrast to studio practice which ‘conceals this condition by separating production from the interests it meets and the demands it responds to at its point of material or symbolic consumption’. In the case of project work, the element of service eliminates such separation since it is consumed at the same time it is produced.

Since there is no other way to make a living as performance artists, Performers Xpress decided to sell their ‘product’, or rather services, directly to the public and promote it as a unique experience that could change their life. They welcome the potential buyers with a few words permeated with a sense of irony:

Is your life meaningless? Are you tired of waiting for something to happen? Order a Performance Xpress! Performers Xpress is a group of young artists who offer a pure and genuine artistic experience to suit your needs. Choose to replace your daily routine with a first class performance. Activate your relationship with your intimate environment and face your everyday reality with new equipment. Invest in Performers Xpress. Your life will never be the same again!

What is also particularly humorous but telling is that the ‘terms and conditions’ the artists detail are inspired and adapted from the rules used at zoos. The performers’ requests include, among others, to not distress or feed them, to not cross the performance space and to be aware of a code of conduct and specific directions that may be provided by the performers and staff. Viewers are also encouraged to choose ‘experience’ over ‘documentation’ and are
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857 It was only very recently, in 2016 (as mentioned earlier in the chapter) that the SMCA initiated a research on the living conditions of artists in Greece. Regarding the cuts in the cultural sector see Tsiara, 2015. A discussion under the title ‘Artists as workers’ had taken place in December 2010 at the Athens School of Fine Arts within the framework of the Festival ‘Τέχνη εν Κίνησι’ [Art in Motion] while the issue of artistic labour has been explored by few performance artists who in most cases presented their work abroad, as for instance Georgia Sagri with Working the No Work (2012) presented at the Whitney Biennale and Foteini Kalle with Work up to Enjoy. Breaks in Between are Mandatory (2014) presented at ‘Month of Performance Art’ in Berlin. Mariana Nikolaou’s ...How Many Hours Have you Worked Today...? included in the DVD of the project Visibility (2007) discussed earlier in the chapter was one of the first performances (video-performance in this case) dealing with the matter of labour.


warned about possible hazards and risks, including free roaming performers and the ( alarming) possibility of eye contact and interaction. In addition, they inform potential customers that during their visit they may be videotaped or photographed by a staff member and that being admitted to the performance site serves as permission for use of their image. Costumers are also advised to seek medical assistance in the unlikely event that they experience psychological or emotional distress. 860

The strategy of Performers Xpress is to, firstly, lure potential visitors or customers with the promise of an unforgettable, intimate experience especially designed for them—a practice commonly used to attract consumers for all kinds of goods and services. Then they quickly move on to set the parameters of the promised experience and behaviour by establishing ‘rules and regulations’ visitors must adhere to so as to enjoy the privilege of such customised experience. The approach adopted by Performers Xpress exemplifies key characteristics of post-Fordist production (flexible, ‘just-in-time’ catering according to demand), as widely discussed in contemporary theory. The promise of ‘experience’ is used as marketing tool not only by contemporary industries but by museums and artists themselves as well, with Abramović’s exhibition The Artist Is Present at MoMA (2010) being a salient example in which the viewers were invited to live the ultimate experience of sitting across from the (legendary) artist.

One of the first academic articles that examined and conceptualised experiences in relation to marketing was Morris Holbrook and Elizabeth Hirschman’s ‘The Experiential Aspects of Consumption: Consumer Fantasies, Feelings, and Fun’ (1982). Positioning their article against the hegemony of the information processing perspective in consumer research, Holbrook and Hirschman explain that ‘consumption has begun to be seen as involving a steady flow of fantasies, feelings, and fun encompassed by what we call the “experiential view”’. 861 The literature on management and marketing of the late 1990s and 2000s followed in great part Holbrook and Hirshman’s view. Experience marketing, being broadly defined as a form of customer-focused marketing activity, creates therefore a connection to customers similar to the personal/individualised connection that the latest trends of one-to-one performances wish to create with the viewers. Such connections are inescapably eliminated when the performance is experienced through/as documentation.

Although Performers Xpress has had no customers so far and has therefore remained partly unrealised, the website successfully addresses two important and contrasting points in relation to the links between performance art and post-Fordism: first, the overvaluation of live experience and, second, the undervaluation of artistic labour. The performers created specific categories to specialise their product according to each buyer’s needs so as to make their ‘enterprise’ more attractive, competitive, and therefore more profitable. Each performance would be conceived just after the order was placed but within limits (the pre-conceived ‘menu’). Performers Xpress did not imagine their service would be ‘exclusive’, i.e. appealing to a limited, privileged consumer, but rather drew on the principles of the fast-food industry in its re-conceptualisation as catering, which is thriving in Greece in recent years. The service offered would be, quick, easy, affordable and yet customised.

Post-Fordism has brought on new modes of exploring both consumption and production diverting the focus from mass production and consumption to the pursuit of ‘higher living standards’ by viewing the consumers as diverse subjects with different needs and goals. Production and consumption became thereby less homogenous and standardised while scale was eventually replaced by scope and range. In other words the shift from Fordism to post-Fordism, signalled the transition from homogeneity to heterogeneity. 862 Part of the post-Fordist economy has also been the experience economy which has spread into a broad range of commercial fields the first decades of the twentieth first century and ‘forms part of a wider policy interest in developing a new “cultural economy”’. 863 As Joseph Pine and James Gilmore note, ‘experience thinking provided a welcome new platform for pursuing new value-creating activity’. 864 The appeal to the heterogeneity of personalised experience constitutes the prevailing feature of the specific project which seems to satirise the fact that performance art is often valued exclusively for its liveness and the extraordinary experience it is supposed to provide.

At the same time the selling of the artists’ labour as a low-price commodity makes a critical comment on the unpaid labour that artists are constantly asked to provide. In the contemporary economies artists (but also audiences) are convinced to undersell (or offer for free) their labour and therefore themselves in the hope that it will lead to future paid work or for the thrill of the work itself. Jen Harvie in Fair Play—Art, Performance and Neoliberalism

863 Ibid., 301.
notes that artists Kate Bond and Morgan Lloyd used 4,000 volunteers as cast and crew for the successful immersive theatrical event (costing 20 pounds a ticket) *You Me Bum Bum Train* (2010–2012), claiming that it would not only be impossible to pay them but also undesirable: ‘Even if we could pay people, it would completely change the dynamic. The whole point is to create an exciting, inclusive experience—for the audience and the performers... it’s really special’. 865 In the ‘culture of new capitalism’ as cultural theorist Richard Sennett has called neoliberal capitalism both artists and audiences are used as flexible and precarious labourers: the condition of labour is depended on flexibility, what Maurizio Lazzarato names ‘precariousness’ and sociologist Ulrich Beck ‘fragility’. Workers have to adapt constantly to new conditions of labour and update their skills, a condition that is seen as freeing and self-fulfilling by the defenders of neoliberalism while for Beck, Sennett and other theorists is fundamentally compromising. 866

A similar, yet different in some ways project, was realised in 2006 in Mexico by a group of artists including Deborah Carnevali, Omar Góngora, Edgar Canul, Omar Euan, Carlos Navarrete and Grabiel Quintal, among others. *Performance a Domilicio* (Home Delivered Performance) was generated as a response to the tenet that photographic and video documentation cannot deliver the experience of a live performance. The artists created a site with a menu of performance pieces that would be delivered upon request. Customers (or ‘the public’) had two options: to order a brand new performance, created and performed especially for each ‘client’ or to choose from a menu of more than forty performances from local and international artists such as Marina Abramović and Ulay, Esther Ferrer, Franco B, Bartolomé Ferrando, Gilbert & George, Vito Acconci, Valie Export, Richard Long, Hermann Nitsch and others. In the first case, the performers would customise each performance according to the place and the type of audience that would attend while in the second case, they would re-enact the selected performance. According to Monica Mayer, the re-enactment was for them ‘a way of sharing history’ and that sharing was actualised not by means of

documentation but through live experience.\textsuperscript{867} The project’s duration was eleven months during which twenty-three performances were realised by a total of ten artists.\textsuperscript{868}

In contrast to Performers Xpress, the Mexican artists provided their service for free and included the reiteration of well-known performances offering short but live art history lessons. Both projects do not only sketch contemporary post-Fordist production, but they also expose the way artists are being produced as and compelled to be entrepreneurs indulging the mandates of neoliberal capitalism. Art practice is increasingly cast as economic practice, urging artists to model creative entrepreneurialism ‘marked by independence and the ability to take initiative, take risks, self start, think laterally, problem-solve, innovative ideas and practices, be productive, effect impact and realize or at least stimulate financial profits’.\textsuperscript{869} As Jen Harvie argues, the entrepreneur artist by working privately for her or his own gain—prioritising self-interest and individualism, constantly pursuing productivity, growth and profit—promotes neoliberalism, the economic practice that fosters private enterprise within ‘free’ or ‘open’ markets over publically regulated economies.\textsuperscript{870} As flexibility is deemed as freeing and self-fulfilling, entrepreneurialism is being ‘sold’ as an opportunity while it is a necessity. According to Tom Fleming and Andrew Erskine, authors of \textit{Supporting Growth in the Arts Economy},

by working more entrepreneurially, flexibly and openly across the overall ecology (thus relieving some of the ‘creative economy imperative’), art will not only get better, but it will be enjoyed by more people, on their own terms, and in deeper and more interactive ways. Here the flows between the arts ecology and creative economy create a dynamic inter-relationship that thrives on innovation, collaboration and exchange: three factors critical to Achieving great art for everyone.\textsuperscript{871}

\textsuperscript{867} Mónica Mayer, ‘Macular Degeneration: Some Peculiar Aspects of Performance Art Documentation’, \textit{Perform, Repeat, Record}, 115.
\textsuperscript{868} The project was funded by a grant from the State Fund for Culture and Arts (Fondo Estatal de Cultura y Artes de Yucatán). In Mexico City the project participated in the \textit{XII International Performance Festival}, organised by Ex-Teresa: Arte Actual. See Debora Carnevali’s website, \url{http://deboracarnevaliramirez.weebly.com/performance-a-domicilio-2006.html} [accessed 10/1/2016].
\textsuperscript{869} Harvie, 2013, 62.
\textsuperscript{870} Ibid., 63.
Artists are ‘requested’ to build their brand, their network and social-media presence to promote themselves. The internet has been a determinant of the culture of creative entrepreneurship since it enables one to promote, sell, deliver directly to the user (as with the above examples of artistic entrepreneurialism) and to network, which is crucial in today’s cognitive-cultural and capitalist economy. It could be said that now the most-successful businesses are those that create experiences rather than products, or create experiences around their products. We might also say that ‘under producerism, in the age of creative entrepreneurship, producing becomes an experience, even the experience. It becomes a lifestyle, something that is packaged as an experience—and an experience, what’s more, after the contemporary fashion: networked, curated, publicized, fetishised, tweeted, catered, and anything but solitary, anything but private’.  

Conclusions

The above discussion on the conditions of production, circulation and preservation of performance art documentation suggests that the absence of research on Greek performance art does not derive from the lack of documentation; rather, to a great extent, this absence must be attributed to a) the absence of institutional infrastructure and the persistent problem of lack of state support and b) the, until recently, extremely conservative approach to art history in Greek higher education. These factors have not impacted performance art exclusively, but contemporary art at large. Nonetheless the characteristics of performance practice made the latter particularly vulnerable in this context—and they still do. The research undertaken for this thesis demonstrates that documents existed from the outset. Yet these have remained hidden—and still do—in private archives (of the artists, their friends, photographers, and so on). At the same time, art history graduates have been actively discouraged from seeking out this admittedly difficult-to-locate material which has been marginalised in their studies as ‘contemporary’ and thus unsuitable for art historical research, which remains tied to archaeology.

It was only in the mid 2000s that the first exhibitions on the art of the 1970s were realised based on documents. Since then, the growing interest in liveness and therefore performance

---

art has increasingly aligned with the international flourishing of live art. Yet, this upsurge of interest has been mainly witnessed in the flourishing of artistic and curatorial production (new festivals/biennales) and much less in the production of critical discourse on liveness and performance art. Since the beginning of the millennium, it seems that ‘experience’ in art has replaced ‘what used to be called aesthetics’ and is ‘still the ultimate criterion’. This obsession with experience has been growing, along with the demand to document and record the experience. The production of innumerable photographs and videos of performance art and their circulation on the internet resonate with and broadly reflect the excessive production of images of everyday life experiences circulating in social media.

The revival of performance and live art has been accompanied, or even effectuated, by a number of ‘turns’ in the field contemporary art and other disciplines such as philosophy, sociology, anthropology, design et al. The ‘performative turn’, the ‘experiential turn’ and the ‘affective turn’ all relate to performance art and its variants. These turns have conferred special value on the notions of presence, liveness, experience, ephemerality and emotion and affect, which interlock with each other and performance art. However, these turns and concepts are not only related to art and other humanities disciplines; they also permeate the actualities of capitalist economy and therefore everyday life.

The notion of the performative derives from the work in speech act theory of the philosopher John Langshaw Austin during his lecture series How to Do Things with Words, given at Harvard University in 1955. Austin did not use the word ‘performativity’, but coined the term ‘performative utterances’ for situations where saying something was doing something, rather than just reporting on or describing reality. He drew therefore a distinction between the ‘performatives’ and the ‘constatives’. A paradigmatic case of the performatives is ‘the utterance “I do” (take this woman to be my lawful wedded wife), as uttered in the course of a marriage ceremony’. Austin argued that a performative utterance cannot be said to be either true or false, as a constative utterance might be. It can only be judged either ‘happy’ or ‘infelicitous’. However, Austin realised halfway through the lecture series that both performative and constative utterances perform actions and that a clear distinction between the two cannot be made.

Austin, 1962, 94 (Lecture VIII).
Since the beginning of the 1990s, the use of the word ‘performative’ has transcended the borders of linguistic philosophy and expanded in the discourse of contemporary art and aesthetics. This transition had an effect in the term’s meaning. As art historian Dorothea von Hantelmann remarks, ‘Today any artwork that in some formal, thematic, or structural way alludes to ideas of embodiment, enactment, staging, or theatre is called performative. Any visual artwork that relates to a here-and-now, and thus in some way or another refers to the idea of performance without being a performance, is called a performative artwork’. 876 For Hantelmann, the new meaning of performativity as ‘performance-like’ is a misunderstanding of the original notion, as the wide use of the term ‘is based on a complete twist of the word’s original meaning’. 877 She argues therefore that ‘there is no performative artwork because there is no nonperformative artwork’. 878 If every utterance entails both constative (reality-describing) and performative (reality-producing) aspects, there is no need to speak about performative language. ‘The same principal applies to artworks. It makes little sense to speak of a performative artwork because every artwork has a reality-producing dimension’. 879 Thus, the performative in art does not define a new category of artworks; it rather suggests a specific methodological orientation that creates a different perspective on what produces meaning in an artwork. ‘What the notion of the performative in relation to art actually points to is a shift from what an artwork depicts and represents to the effects and experiences that it produces—or, to follow Austin, from what it “says” to what it “does.” In principle, the performative triggers a methodological shift in how we look at any artwork and in the way in which it produces meaning’. 880

The shift from what an artwork says to what it does is also related to the shift from the production of meaning to the production of emotion discussed earlier. This new methodological approach not only of performance art but art in general reflects John Dewey’s theory on the perception of art as experience. Although Dewey’s insights on how to experience art—developed in 1934—are valuable, his work has remained relatively unread despite the currency of his ideas. 881 ‘The primacy of interaction as experiential encounter

877 Ibid.
878 Ibid.
879 Ibid.
880 Ibid.
881 Joyce Brodsky has noted that ‘while French theory has dominated the academy, Dewey’s work has, for the most part, remained unread in spite of the currency of many of his ideas’. 2002. ‘How to “See” With the Whole Body’, Visual Studies. 17/2: 99-112, 107. Mary Jane Jacobs also notes that Dewey’s ‘value is yet to be fully
with things in the world’ is fundamental to his philosophy. However, Dewey does not defend the creation of some new art that will exist to construct or foster experiences; instead he suggests that the value of all art should not lie in the final end product per se but in the human conditions under which it was created and in the experience it is to generate. Throughout his essay, he attacks the common conception that the work of art as an object (painting, statue, book, etc.) that exists autonomously and independently from human experience because it ‘creates conventions that get in the way of fresh insight’. He therefore suggests a new approach to the philosophy of the aesthetic that would set the focus on concrete, ordinary experience, ‘a conception of fine art that sets out from its connection with discovered qualities of ordinary experience will be able to indicate the factors and forces that favour the normal development of common human activities into matters of artistic value’. One could say that Dewey is not in favour of new forms of art production but a new philosophy of art that would introduce new ways of approaching, valuating and interpreting the already extant art. He believes therefore that experience is related to all art, but its value has not been acknowledged as it should have been. Drawing on this approach, one could refute the primacy of live art in the production of experience since experience can be effected by other forms of art, too.

Dewey also makes an important distinction between experience and an experience:

Experience occurs continuously, because the interaction of live creature and environing conditions is involved in the very process of living. Under conditions of resistance and conflict. Aspects and elements of the self and the world that are implicated in this interaction qualify experience with emotions and ideas so that conscious intent emerges. Oftentimes, however, the experience had is inchoate. Things are experienced but not in such a way that they are composed into an experience. There is distraction and dispersion; what we observe and what we think, what we desire and what we get, are at odds with each other. We put our hands to the plow and turn


884 Ibid., 10.
back; we start and then we stop, not because the experience has reached the end for the sake of which it was initiated but because of extraneous interruptions or of inner lethargy. In contrast with such experience, we have an experience when the material experienced runs its course to fulfillment. Then and then only is it integrated within and demarcated in the general stream of experience from other experiences.  

Cultural anthropologist Victor Turner remarked in his essay on the anthropology of experience (1987) that the distinction between mere ‘experience’ and ‘an experience’ had also been made by philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey in 1914: ‘Mere experience is simply the passive endurance and acceptance of events. An experience, like a rock in a Zen sand garden, stands out from the evenness of passing hours and years and forms what Dilthey called a “structure of experience”. In other words, it does not have an arbitrary beginning and ending, cut out of the stream of chronological temporality, but has what Dewey called “an initiation and a consummation”. Perhaps then, what live art intends to provide is an experience that has an initial moment, a structure and a consummation and will succeed in transforming the viewer. Yet, the mere factor of liveness cannot guarantee the production of such an experience. On the contrary, in some cases the production of experience might be bound for immediate consumption. For instance, when the viewer is visiting a performance art festival, she or he is invited to experience and participate in a great number of performances, taking place one after the other, sometimes even simultaneously; she or he is therefore expected to constantly interact and communicate with numerous artists and other viewers throughout the day in her or his effort to attend as many performances as possible. The experience of live art then might acquire qualities similar to those of shopping experience or therapy. Thus, at the end of the day, the viewers might be left with a great amount of photographs and videos documenting their experience, but without an experience other, that is, than the experience of consumption.

Art according to Dewey has the potentiality to create by means of new objects, new modes of experience. This would mean that diverse means of performance art (liveness and mediation) have the potentiality to produce diverse but of equal importance forms of experiences. Engaging with performance art through documentation is therefore also

885 Ibid., 36-37.
experiential and can even produce a more complete experience of the event if it consists of diverse forms of documentation that address different aspects of the performance.

Live art and the experience it fosters go hand in hand with ephemerality, a condition that was linked to an anti-capitalist ideology by performance artists in the 1960s and 1970s, when the ephemeral and immaterial was considered as resistant to a capitalist mode of production still reliant on manufacture (and in these they were wrong, as capitalist production was already shifting o services, especially in the West). Peggy Phelan, for example, has argued that performance art ‘clogs the smooth machinery of reproductive representation necessary to the circulation of capital’, suggesting that performance is essentially anti-capitalist.\(^{888}\) This idea of ephemerality as anti-capitalist might have contributed to the praise of live art that has occurred since the early 2000s. On the other hand, documentation has been charged with performance’s re-materialisation and therefore objectification and commodification (despite the fact that photography was used by conceptual artists as an immaterial means/form of art and that the body is anyhow material). However, neither ephemerality nor immateriality can any longer be considered as conditions opposed to capitalism. Mauruzio Lazzarato has argued that immaterial labour exists in the form of networks and flows and therefore the cycle of production is not obviously apparent to the eye because it escapes the four walls of a factory, which in the case of artistic production, would be the four walls of the artist studio. Therefore, as Lazzarato explains,

Precariousness, hyperexploitation, mobility, and hierarchy are the most obvious characteristics of metropolitan immaterial labor. Behind the label of the independent ‘self-employed’ worker, what we actually find is an intellectual proletarian, but who is recognized as such only by the employers who exploit him or her. It is worth noting that in this kind of working existence it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish leisure time from work time. In a sense, life becomes inseparable from work. This labour form is also characterised by real managerial functions that consist in 1) a certain ability to manage its social relations and 2) the eliciting of social cooperation within the structures of the basin of immaterial labour.\(^{889}\)

---

\(^{888}\) Phelan, 1996, 148.
\(^{889}\) Lazzarato. 2006 [1996], 136.
As Kunst explains, the artistic work is now produced in post-Fordist methods, being open, flexible, communicative and affective and the artist as producer is skilled at various creative and production techniques that conform to the development of contemporary capitalism. The visibility of artistic work is therefore ‘possible due to the precariou­sness, flexibility and inconstancy of work in general, due to the fetishisation of non-material and speculative experience as the basic social and communicative experience that can be enabled by artistic work’. Both the ephemerality and immateriality of artistic work are therefore conditions that go hand in hand with capitalist production and force the artist to function as ‘multi-machine’ to remain visible while performativity in terms of both performance-like and the capacity of speech/communication to act or consummate an action, or to construct and perform an identity is not only relevant to the artwork but also to the work in itself.

In a similar way, experience, emotion and affect that have been fostered by performance art, have also been fostered by capitalism. Already in 2004, Claire Bishop has suggested the growth of experience formats in visual art dovetails with an ‘experience economy’, the shift from a goods and service-based economy to an experience-based economy. In the experience economy the aim of the purchase is no longer to own a product (be it a good or service), but to use it in order to enjoy an exciting/interesting experience. Yet, there is a new transition to be acknowledged within the economy and in relation to the affective turn: the shift from experience to transformative experience. According to Pine and Gilmore, the main difference between experience and transformation is that the latter occurs when an experience is customised:

> When you customise an experience to make it just right for an individual—providing exactly what he needs right now—you cannot help changing that individual. When you customise an experience, you automatically turn it into a transformation, which companies create on top of experiences (recall that phrase: ‘a life-transforming experience’), just as they create experiences on top of services and so forth.

---

890 Kunst, 2015, 145. Claire Bishop has also stressed the connection of participatory art with neoliberalism’s recent forms (networks, mobility, project work, affective labour) in *Artificial Hells*, 277.
891 Kunst, 2015, 146.
Similar is the development of performance art; with one-to-one and immersive performances, artists are staging experiences addressed to single viewers, and executed specially for their personal transformation. Performers Xpress is an exemplary case of such an approach; the product to be purchased is a personal ‘life changing’ experience that addresses the specific needs of each viewer and promises an unforgettable experience (though with a sense of irony). Such personal performances do not wish to generate a communal experience/ a sense of community, as it has been claimed for performance art, but rather an individualised one. The transformative experience, effectuated through emotion and affects, is also noted by performance theory, as discussed earlier in the chapter.

I would suggest that the turn to performativity, experience and affect/emotion has effectuated another turn, the ‘subjective turn’ which pertains not only to the viewers’ participation in, and transformation through, the artistic process but also to their latest/new role as documenters and evaluators of the artistic process. The term ‘subjective’ has been used in the past to illustrate a turn to the personal and private during the post-war years, but discussion has focused primarily on the subjectivity of the artist rather than the viewer. The subjective turn in relation to the viewer discloses therefore a new proposition for diverse approaches and actualisations of documentation which would render it not only performative but experiential as well. In the case studies examined in the fourth part of the chapter, documentation is not produced as visual representation of the action but rather as subjective expression/interpretation (and sometimes critical appraisal) of the experience the performance provided. The consideration of testimonies and critical writing as supplementary forms of documentation contrast the conviction that documentation should be as objective as


895 Auslander has argued that ‘performance documents in all media are not just records of performances that happened but are themselves performative’. He is suggesting that ‘performance documents are not analogous to constatives, but to performatives: in other words, the act of documenting an event as a performance is what constitutes it as such. Documentation does not simply generate image/statements that describe an autonomous performance and state that it occurred: it produces an event as a performance. Auslander. 2006. ‘The Performativity of Performance Documentation’, PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art, 28/3, 5.
possible defended by sculptor, theatre maker, editor, and academic Michael Kirby and others.\footnote{Auslander discusses Kirby and Susan Sontag’s opposition to criticism in ‘Surrogate Performance’ \url{http://www.walkerart.org/collections/publications/performativity/surrogate-performances/} \[accessed 13/12/2016\]}

Kirby, referring mainly to theatre documentation, stresses that the task for performance documentation is to provide adequate information so as to allow the reader/viewer of the performance document to experience the performance itself. He considers therefore performance documents as ‘surrogate performance[s]’.\footnote{Michael Kirby. 1971. ‘Documentation, Criticism, and History’, Drama Review 15/4, 4.} However, he argues that the record should preserve ‘the objective nature of a presentation’ and be devoid of any critical or subjective approach, drawing this way a clear distinction between documentation and criticism:

Let us not confuse criticism and documentation. Most criticism involves little documentation, and true documentation is in no way critical. A distinction must be made between subjective and objective information, between that which appears in a particular way to one observer and that which appears in the same way to all observers, between reactions, opinions and evaluations on one hand and factual reporting on the other.\footnote{Ibid. Kirby even suggests that critics should be replaced by analysts: ‘Indeed, if a critic is considered merely as someone who passes value judgments, there is no need for critics at all. Perhaps the term should be retired and replaced with the concept of theatrical analyst. At any rate, the objective description or documentation makes no claim of “good” or “bad”. It merely presents “raw material” for study and analysis’, ibid., 5.}

The case studies examined in part four are exemplary as subjective records of documentation. Testimonies/oral histories are evaluated not despite, but because of, their subjective qualities which may pose an alternative to Kirby’s prioritisation of objective record. The turn to the viewers as documenters and evaluators of the performance aligns with the general activation of the consumer as ‘reviewer’ of all kinds of products, services and experiences. Consumers are constantly asked to review anything they have paid money for. They are also called upon to document their experiences and display them for others to see. For instance, Trip Advisor, among many other similar websites, asks its users to write about their experience, evaluate the producer of the experience and the experience itself, and document it with their own of photographs (of the restaurant, meal, hotel, bar, etc.) Of course, interviewing the viewers of a performance is not the same as ranking goods and services with ‘stars’ but it bears similarities to methods used by art institutions to calculate the impact of the performance/event on their public and, consequently, their popularity. In As One, for
instance, the visitors, after trying the Abramović method, were asked to write about their experience and some of the ‘reviews’ (positive ones) became available online so as to represent a sense/feeling of the experience and also to attract more viewers.

The ‘raw material’ Kirby anticipates for study and analysis and the rigorous distinction between ‘criticism and analysis, opinion and evidence, value judgment and fact’ is diametrically opposed not only to the subjective material of testimonies/personal views and critical writing that I propose here as alternative forms of documentation but also to the expansion of performance’s meaning through its reconstruction. If the document’s aim is to provide its viewers with an experience as close as possible to that of the initial event or performance, I agree with Kirby that documenting should be ‘as completely as possible’. Yet I do not concur with the way he defines completeness: the quality of being whole and having nothing missing cannot, and should not, be confined to illusory objectivity. Instead, and in order to provide the viewer with access to the complexity of experience in the performance, the document should be expanded and include, apart from photographs and videos, both personal testimonies and interpretations and critical writing. Evaluating and construing, in addition to recording or rather as a means of recording, will not prevent the reader from responding to the documentation ‘in much the same way as he would have responded to the performance’ as Kirby claims. On the contrary, it will provide an opening for the production of new spaces of meaning and the elicitation of diverse responses from audiences.

---

899 Ibid., 5.7.
900 Ibid., 3.
Conclusion

This study aimed to address a troubling gap in the histories of contemporary Greek art by exploring the genre of performance, one marginalised in historical and theoretical discourse. I have sought to identify key issues in the emergence and trajectory of performance art from the 1970s until the 2010s, and have provided an up to the time writing these lines unique presentation and interpretation of performative artworks, most of which have never been discussed in Greek histories of contemporary art. This research therefore makes a significant contribution in presenting new material within a theoretical framework that offers an in-depth analysis of works. I have also aimed to show that the potential inclusion of the Greek performance art scene in studies of performance as an international field can generate new understandings and raise new questions. This concluding chapter integrates issues and concepts introduced throughout the thesis to address my key research questions and reaffirm my main arguments. Given that the general historical and theoretical literature on Greek performance art is scant and inconclusive, the first crucial question posed in this study was why performance art has been so neglected and marginalised by art historians in Greece. Numerous other research questions were later addressed in different chapters of the thesis:

- How did the military Junta of 1967-1974 contribute to the emergence and establishment of performance art in Greece?
- In what ways does cultural diversity affect the production and reception of performance (either by Greek artists presenting their work abroad or by artists of non-Greek origin living and working in Greece)?
- Does the site (institutional or other) of performance art determine its production and reception, and if so, in what ways?
- What prompted the intense re-emergence of performance art along with participatory post-performance practices in Greece in the late 1990s? Was it an outcome of broader socio-economic conditions, a new ‘social turn’ in Greece, or did it address the need to follow the current trends of a still hegemonic Western art scene?
- What are the links between feminism and performance art in Greece, and in what ways has the ideology of so-called post-feminism affected the production of performance?
- What are the links and discontinuities between performance art and post-performance practices?
Can performance have a history without the document, and what is the role of the latter in the proliferation/dissemination and establishment of performance art as a distinct genre?

In the first part of my Conclusions, I synthesise my findings about performance art in Greece. I argue that performance indeed had a strong presence from the 1970s up to the 2010s, in contrast to what extant histories of contemporary Greek art suggest. In this part, I also affirm that performance art in Greece can claim particularities but also similarities with regard to the development of performative practices in the West. In the second part, I demonstrate the significant contribution that this research makes to the theoretical discourse on performance and post-performance practices through the examination of unexplored aspects of such practices. Finally, the third part of Conclusions identifies the need for further research into the specific subject area, which often intersects with other fields such as new media art and requires additional research in Greece and beyond.

1. Potentialities, Impossibilities, Failures, and the (non) Particularities of Greek Performance Art

Through the examination of multiple case studies, this thesis has aimed to detect the possible particularities but also connections of Greek performance art to the international trends of the genre appearing mainly on the dominant Western art scene. Moreover, the study has set the focus not only on the possibilities/potentialities and achievements, but also on the impossibilities and failures of performance art.

One of the main particularities of Greek performance art seems to be the socio-political conditions under which it emerged. As Chapter 1 showed, censorship was the salient condition to have contributed to the emergence of a radical new artistic language that, most likely, would not otherwise have been accepted by Greek publics. The chapter argued, with the use of Michel Foucault’s writings on censorship, that the expurgation of the authorised vocabulary gave rise to ‘a veritable discursive explosion’ while ‘a whole rhetoric of allusion and metaphor’ was activated. Another particularity of Greek performance art of the 1970s was its focus on the viewers’ bodies as participant subjects in spaces of resistance; this is in

---

contrast to the West, where performance artists placed themselves at the centre of their work and used their bodies as a system upon or with which a series of actions or procedures were carried out.

All chapters explored the diverse sites where performance art has taken place throughout the years, such as galleries, museums, biennales, conferences, and various public and semi-public spaces: namely the train station and porn cinema in Mary Zygouri’s case, the farmer’s market where the Visibility project was realised, sites of protest in which Marios Chatziprokopiou’s performance was integrated, squares and streets where Katalipsi and Karatransavardia practiced their interventions, and so on. I thus showed that, as a genre, performance art has also succeeded in encountering diverse audiences, not only of different classes but also of different political inclinations. However, as discussed in Chapter 5, the lower classes’ encounters with performance art still take place only outside the institution, as the typical audience of art remains homogeneous in terms of class, namely belonging to the bourgeoisie, as Pierre Bourdieu demonstrated already decades ago. This in turn denotes that performance art has indeed failed to bring the working class into the museum merely by intervening in working-class spaces. As discussed in Chapter 2, the intervention of the performing bodies in public spaces has also made explicit that the production of meaning within the spaces of intersubjectivity that performance art generates is contingent upon and closely related to cultural and national identity. Moreover, the intrusion of performance art in public space has shown that when the element of confrontation is missing in cases where democracy is indeed practiced, performance artists fail to make their cause public and the artwork fails to complete its political mission. Yet, as discussed in Chapter 3, performance art has been used by artists not only with the intent to transmit radical messages and provoke confrontation but also to convey conservative ideas and promote compliance - as in the case of Niki Kanagini.

Another particularity of the reception of performance art in Greece is related to the overall lack of infrastructure for the study of performance and the inadequacies and limitations of art history as practiced in Greece. As argued in Chapter 5, performance in Greece did not emerge out of an aspiration to make art that would be undocumentable. The marginalisation of performance practices and the lack of their historisation cannot be attributed to their ontology or the absence of documentation. It is instead, at least partly, an outcome of the impossibility of the documents’ preservation and circulation, and thus their inaccessibility due to the lack of both an appropriate infrastructure and relevant scholarship. Therefore, this study not only documents the performances, but also registers and maps historical moments and
circumstances that would have otherwise been lost, constituting the sole record of a great number of performative artworks. As such, by providing a sustained historical and theoretical analysis of the diverse realisations of performance art in Greece, this art historical study offers belated visibility to the socio-political causes that engendered these works and contributes to the undoing of Greek performance artists’ invisibility, generated and sustained due to a number of reasons:

1) A lack of archival infrastructure and institutional support.
2) Until recently, the active dissuasion (to the point of prohibition) of art historians and theorists from approaching and reflecting critically on recent and current paradigms of contemporary art and especially of performative practices, which by being ephemeral created the impression (for some) that they are also inaccessible and impossible to study unless one has been present in their realisation.
3) The hegemony of formalism in Greek art history and criticism, which has prevented, for the most part, any other approach and methodology. This is a significant difference in art historical discourse between Greece and the West.

Moreover, many of the case studies examined in this thesis have shown that Greek identity has been a determinant in the production as well as in the perception and reception of Greek performance art since its emergence. Local issues – usually related to the special socio-political but also economic conditions of the country and their ramifications – have preoccupied, not exclusively but to a great extent, artists in Greece. As art historian Christoforos Marinos suggested in 2006, the fact that Greek art seemed to negotiate issues with a more ‘introvert’ and local character probably contributed to its isolation and detachedness from the international art scene.\textsuperscript{903} However, other factors related to the life and work of artists based in a ‘periphery’ or ‘semi-periphery’ (such as Greece) and who thus make their work outside the dominant art centres have most likely contributed to the isolation of contemporary Greek art. Namely, the almost complete lack of institutional support, related also to the absence of funding and resources for the making and dissemination of work, and which impacts performance artists the hardest, as discussed in Chapter 5; but also the lack of a historical and theoretical discourse that might have brought forth diverse readings of the artworks beyond the artists’ intentions—all these factors underpin the isolation suffered by

\textsuperscript{903} Christoforos Marinos. 2006. \textit{Πιθανότητες: Συνεντεύξεις με Νέους Έλληνες Καλλιτέχνες} [Possibilities: Interviews with Young Greek Artists] (Fututra), 269.
Greek art and performance in particular. Had such a theoretical discourse existed it might have generated a spectrum of interpretations beyond ‘the local’. For instance, as discussed in Chapter 2, in her performance Tama Art Evangelia Basdekis drew attention to the lack of institutional support and museums’ refusal to accept performance art in Greece. Yet the performance could also be related to women’s struggles, witnessed globally, for access to the institution. Moreover, the performances of Maria Karavela, Theodoros, and Dimitris Alithinos during the 1970s can also draw connections to the general conditions of capitalism’s biopolitical violence, as argued in Chapter 1, instead of being interpreted exclusively in relation to the military regime. In parallel, however, these artists, as many others, have also produced work whose driving concepts clearly exceed any ‘local’ specificity: the exile body (Maria Papadimitriou’s T.A.M.A., Group Savra’s collaborative Egnatia Road, and Marios Spiliopoulos Human Trace); post-Fordist immaterial labour (Angeliki Avgitidou and Foteini Kalle’s Performers Xpress); social reproduction (Foteini Kalle’s Reproduction), and other gender-related issues, as discussed in Chapter 3.

Although performative artworks have been marginalised in Greece and thrust aside by galleries and related art institutions for many years, since the late 1990s we witness an increasing production of performative site-, context-, and audience-specific performances and post-performance participatory projects. These are, for the most part, realised by an emergent younger art scene. Ambitious, oriented towards an international mainstream of art biennials and magazines but also conversant with the radical demands of generated by the Greek crisis and the crisis of neoliberalism on a global scale, this scene has so far avoided its identification with a debilitating Greek-centred parochialism and its attendant inferiority complexes - T.A.M.A. and Egnatia Road could be considered exemplary, in this regard. Many Greek artists, after having completed studies in Europe or the US, become ‘international artists’, no longer based exclusively in Greece. Their projects often contextualise Greek socio-political issues (such as ethnic minorities, refugees, the financial crisis) within international art tendencies and theoretical concerns, rendering Greek art more accessible and in a way cosmopolitan (in lack of a better term).
3. Towards New Theoretical Conceptualisations of Performance and Post-Performance Art

The thesis explored various kinds of performative intervention realised under diverse terms and generating multiple ways of public participation or its negation. The relation between intervention and public place examined through the work of individual artists and collectives has indicated an interpretation of performance as an ‘event’, in Alain Badiou’s terms. If the contribution of performance art lies in the disruption of the status quo and the interruption of the constructed ‘normality’ imposed in public spaces, or as Chantal Mouffe has put it in the disruption of ‘the smooth image that corporate capitalism is trying to spread, bringing to the fore its repressive character’, as argued in Chapter 2, then a performance should carry the qualities of an event as defined by Badiou.904 The event—and accordingly, a performance—does not make sense according to the normative rules of a ‘situation’. Thus, for there to be an event, there must be an intervention which subverts the rules of the situation to allow that particular event to be.905 This is also when performance art succeeds in its intervention in the public space and disrupts the situation instead of becoming the situation itself.

The effectuation of such a disruption presupposes the creation of intersubjective space, which in turn cannot be activated without the bodies of both the artist and the public. The materiality of the body has strangely been dismissed as a major constituent of performance art, which has most commonly been deemed as an immaterial form of art transferring the materiality of the body to the materiality of the document. This transfer is the necessary condition for performance not so much to enter but more so to remain and proliferate in the institutional spaces where culture, but also capital, circulates.906

The production of intersubjective spaces is also fostered in post-performative participatory practices. Through the discussion of post-performance community-based practices, in Chapter 4 I brought together Chantal Mouffe’s agonistic spaces and Mikhail Bakhtin’s idea of dialogue using the writings of philosopher Leszek Koczanowicz to suggest a third possibility for democratic artistic spaces beyond Claire Bishop’s aesthetics of antagonism and Grant Kester’s dialogical aesthetics, that would combine both antagonism and dialogue. As

905 See Alain Badiou [Translated by Alberto Toscano]. 2009. Logics of Worlds: Being and Event II (Continuum).
Koczanowicz suggests, antagonism and consensus are not inevitably contradictory but can be treated as complementary, while dialogue in democracy can transcend both antagonistic and consensual perspectives. Bakhtin’s idea of dialogue as a combination of different voices, each having its own form and content without being assimilated, is vital to the construction of a non-consensual notion of democracy. Then, democracy and, accordingly, the democratic spaces that artists aspire to produce through post-performative practices could be seen as ‘a complicated set of conversations that do not necessarily lead to a consensus but could promote better understanding between all participants in the political struggle’. The question that arises is what ‘better’ can mean and according to what criteria. What I therefore suggest is that it is crucial for the intersubjective spaces created through such practices to acknowledge the antagonistic and conflictive dimension of dialogue so as not to fall into the trap of political correctness (the critique of which has recently been appropriated by a range of neo-fascisms towards the formulation of anti-democratic agendas), dismissing the fact that democracy is about both agreement and disagreement.

Finally, this study has sought to define the connection and disconnection between performance art and post-performance art, drawing on Judith Butler’s theory on performativity. The case studies examined suggest that if one accepts the concept of performativity as analysed by Butler, then performance as an ‘act’ is something distinct and not inherent to performativity. Butler argues: ‘What is “performed” works to conceal, if not to disavow, what remains opaque, unconscious, unperformable’. Reducing performance to performativity would therefore be a mistake. The artist’s body during the condition of performance is not akin to the bodies of the primary audiences that play a vital role in the production of post-performative practices, since they are not acting but in fact performing, or asked to perform specific parts of their own identity.

In an effort to offer a new definition of performance art that also draws connections with post-performative practices, I suggest that performance art can be effectuated as a battleground, where established identities engage in confrontation with the mechanisms of subjectivity production. In other words, performance art is a shared social space that has the potential to become a ‘third space’, or, a space of thirdness, and site of negotiation, where

---

909 Ibid.
subjects are able to come together, even momentarily, through a creative process where difference and dissonance, resistance and interruption produce the conditions for the emergence of something new.\textsuperscript{910}

3. Study Limitations, Future Trends, and Research Directions

This study has offered a historical and critical perspective on an important aspect of contemporary Greek art. It was conducted through the examination and appraisal of the sparse existing literature, but also, and primarily, through interviews and archival research, realised to a large extent through meetings with the artists and less through visits to archives of institutions and online websites. As a direct consequence of this methodology, the study has some limitations that need to be considered. The lack of publicly held archives, as mentioned in the introduction and extensively discussed in Chapter 5, was clearly an impediment to the research. Relying almost exclusively on the artists’ availability and personal archives was sometimes challenging. Although the majority of artists, curators, and art historians were available and extremely helpful, this was not always the case, and I have been unable to meet with all artists, curators and historians I had originally planned. Moreover, some artists did not have an organised archive of documentation of their performances, so it was impossible to acquire a complete overview of their work. Of course, it was practically impossible to interview every single artist who has ever engaged in performance and related work since, as I have come to realise, there is a truly great number of Greek artists who currently operate in the field. It is therefore evident that there is a great need for further research so as to detect and bring to visibility more material and thus examine further aspects of the development and current trends of performance art in Greece.

The scale of my research was extensive and multifaceted, even though it concerned local case studies. Yet several issues require further research in relation not only to the development of performance art in Greece, but also to this body of work’s incorporation within a broader, even global context of performative practices and contemporary art overall. Exploring the following as future research subject matters could facilitate the attainment of this goal:

\textsuperscript{910} The ‘third space’ is a theory of identity and community attributed to Homi Bhabha. See Homi Bhabha K. 2004. \textit{The Location of Culture} (Routledge).
• The emergence and action of art groups and collectives founded during the 1950s to 1970s.911
• Experiments not only of collaboration but also of coexistence and symbiosis through artistic practices by recent art groups.
• The intersection of performance with new media/digital art and the culture of gaming.
• Performance art in other southern European countries that were also under dictatorship when it emerged.

The emergence of art groups and collectives in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, some of which were mentioned in the introduction and Chapter 2, may have had an important impact on both the emergence and the evolution of performance art within the visual arts field. Most of these groups prioritised and advanced communication, pedagogy, action outside the institution, and interdisciplinarity, and aimed to bring the visual arts closer to the general public, including the lower classes which would rarely visit the museum. Although their actions were often innovative, at least for the Greek art scene of those decades, they have not been studied thoroughly, and there are very few references related to them. I believe that the tracing and recording along with the in-depth analysis of their activities would be useful for the history, or pre-history, of performance art, but also for the history of contemporary Greek art in general.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the concept of collaboration—between artists themselves but also between artists and publics—has been explored in various ways by numerous artists globally since the 1990s. Especially in the last decade or so, Greek society has experienced an intense revival of collectivism, in terms of both collective forms of protest and self-organisation, and this has had an effect on artistic practices, as I have shown in different parts of this thesis. What is usually underscored in the experiments of collaboration but also of coexistence and symbiosis through artistic practices is the idea of community as a ‘natural’ and harmonious social environment. However, a more meticulous investigation of the social relations developed within such collectives could perhaps undermine such an impression of idyllic collaborations. Hence, it would be interesting to investigate not only the assumed benefits and accomplishments, but also the impediments and failures of collective process, action, and symbiosis. How do artists themselves operate within the collectives, to what extent do they

911 It should be noted that book-length research into the rise of groups and collectives in Europe as a shared space of political engagement is relatively recent. See Jacopo Galimberti. 2017. Individuals against Individualism: Art Collectives in Western Europe (University of Liverpool Press), where however Greek case studies are not included.
compromise, and how do they handle confrontation? Although this thesis has looked into aspects of failure with regard to both performance art and community-based projects, it has not really touched upon the experience of failure on the part of the artistic subjects themselves. How do artists confront the possible failure of their own integration in art communities or collectives, and what could this mean for the production of collaborative artistic practices?

Although this thesis has explored several aspects of performance art, much remains to be investigated. A new generation of multidisciplinary artists (most of them born in the 1980s) combine and bring together performance and new media in hybrid artistic practices. Specifically, they work with electronics, real-time image and sound generation, interactive installations, algorithmic video, or even e-textiles, combining them with performance and urban interventions while focusing on the concept of the body as an interface. Performance studies have been defying disciplinary boundaries for years now, while the impact of digital technology on performance art has been reflected in conferences, workshops, and scholarly publications especially since the mid 2000s. Performance studies are now represented/included in panels on video games, as streams in conferences on digital art, and in showcases at computer conferences. Although Chapter 5 looked into immersive performance practices and the implementation of virtual reality to them, there are many more diverse paradigms unfolding at the intersection of performance and digital media that should be examined and situated within the multimedia structures that seem to be in constant interaction with socio-political reality and everyday life. Artists Aphrodity Psara and Caterina Antonopoulou along with the groups Medea Electronic and Frowntails are just indicative examples of this emergent generation that experiments with performance and digital media.

Throughout the years of my research, I have come to realise that histories of performance art have been neglected not only in Greece but also in other Southern European countries, such as Spain and Portugal, which were also under right-wing military dictatorships during the 1960s and 1970s (Portugal 1926-1974 and Spain 1939-1975). While it is clear that the genre of performance art does have a history in those countries, there is an evident lack of its

---

recording, certainly in the English language but likely also in Spanish and Portuguese. It would be of value to examine, through a comparative study, if and how dictatorships influenced the emergence and development of performance in these countries as well. For instance, Cláudia Madeira suggests that the Portuguese dictatorship ‘might, in itself, have contained the necessary elements for a halting development’ of performative hybrid artistic practices. The possible particularities of performance art in Southern European countries could open up the possibility to reconsider alternative histories of performative practices outside the dominant historiographies of the Western art centres. All in all, there are still many gaps to fill with regard to an international history of performance art.

The contribution of this study to the field of performance art can be summarised as follows. I began by examining the previous sporadic historical references to the under-researched subject matter of the emergence and development of performance art in Greece since the 1970s, the evident lack of which has impacted upon the broader histories of contemporary Greek art. The thesis then used the Greek case studies to illuminate new aspects and characteristics not only of performance but also of post-performance participatory practices, and to present new theoretical conceptualisations. By identifying principal issues in the production, dissemination, and reception of performance art in Greece from the 1970s to the 2010s, I have aimed to provide a critical analysis not only of the potentialities and achievements but also of the dead ends and shortcomings of performative practices. In this way, I have sought to negate the common apprehension that performance has only had a limited and inconsistent presence in Greece. To this end, I have argued that the artists included (and many more that I have unable to include) are conclusively and irrevocably part of the history of performance in the 20th and 21st centuries, establishing the need for further research and cross-cultural investigations and reflections. I hope the thesis will provide a useful starting point for scholars piecing together a history of performance of an international outlook.

As regards the thesis’ prospective impact on Greek art history, in the course of writing I came to realise that most of the chapters could develop into autonomous and separate doctoral

913 When meeting other art historians in conferences/ festivals they would affirm my impression that the history of performance art in both Portugal and Spain has been forgotten. For Portugal see Cláudia Madeira. 2016. ‘Transgenealogies of Portuguese Performance Art’, Performance Research, 21/5: 37-46 where the author also confirms that artists in Portugal are unaware of the presence of performance art since the 1960s in the country.

studies. Yet my emphasis has been in proposing a more general framework while beginning from scratch. Historical research into the specific subject matter was vital and necessary (since it was non-existent) in order to proceed to convincing theoretical analysis. Thus, I would hope that the thesis might enable a broader scholarly dialogue on the subject within Greek art history and inspire further research in discrete subjects, some of which have been merely identified in my research. This will no doubt be a collective enterprise, carried out by multiple subjects, but it should also be clear that for this to happen Greece needs both a carefully planned expansion of its contemporary art infrastructure and a rethinking of the priorities and foci of Greek art history. As a final note, I hope that this research will contribute to changing things in this direction.
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