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Shifting perspectives of space

α Studio
Introduction/Εισαγωγή

Rationale
UA Research & Design Project

Since the 1970s the world has been transformed dramatically under the guise of economic ‘liberalization’, political ‘democratization’, and socio-cultural ‘globalization’. An entire generation has been shaped and defined by the precepts of the hegemonic neoliberal capitalist regime. The consequences are just becoming evident today as asymmetries in all fields prevail, while the economy continuously spirals in whirlwinds of small and large crises. The advance of global neoliberal capitalism has left behind a landscape of uneven distribution of wealth, power and opportunities. Recovery, it seems, has become not more than another buzzword in the failed but prevailing economic and political system under which we all have to operate today. The most recent development of contemporary neoliberal capitalism, namely the absurd strategies for economic and political survival of the Eurozone, is a startling example of the aftermath of widespread crisis: when we look at the situation in Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain it becomes clear that the system has indeed come into too easily could be its end-game. Beyond the advance of testing-grounds and neoliberal experiments in the global south typical of the 1970s and 1980s (see Chile, i.e.), or the progression of privatization sprees of the Western hinterlands (see Eastern Europe, i.e.) during the 1990s, today we witness the progression of the system well into its own economic regions and territories. Beyond militarization and the advance of the police state typical of a capitalist system in crisis during the first decade of 2000, today we are experiencing what many scholars have classified as the self-destruction of the capitalist system in its present application: neoliberalism.

Although the explanations of the recent failure of the neoliberal capitalist system often beget the economic and political angles, placing only tangential attention to the social costs and burdens, there is a very important angle to the whole problématique of contemporary global capitalism, which has systematically been neglected: the spatial problem. The materialist perspective of recent crises of global neoliberalism calls out for an historical understanding of the context under which these crises have taken place and shape; an historical materialist position, which will undoubtedy be addressed best from a Marxist perspective. The challenge, however, will be then to remain within the realms of our spatial disciplines without losing the social, economic and political contexts.

The Urban Asymmetries Research and Design Project has traced the origin of the neoliberal experiment throughout it different stages and regions, investigating the diverse and specific forces and contexts that accompanied these shifts, elucidating on the different outcomes and implications that these have had over the built environment and the city (and its inhabitants). The last consequence of neoliberal capitalist regimes seems to point the study back to its origins: the heartland of the global north. Whether USA or Western Europe, what we are witnessing today is the crumbling of one of the strongest (if not the strongest) economic region, the Eurozone.

During the Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 our study group will initially focus on the situation presently developing in Europe as a whole in an attempt to designate a general research direction to frame a more specific thematic.
We will deal with different contexts of crisis within the so-called PIIGS countries (Portugal, Italy, Ireland Greece, and Spain), concentrating ultimately on the situation in Greece. In the form of independent and collective research efforts, also termed “perspectives”, the study group approach the situation of Athens and develop a methodology of theoretical and analytical frames that will serve the purpose of setting the context –or problematique- that arises from an economic and financial crisis and affects the urban environment in radical and dramatic ways. In this studio we will consider these contextual changes as “neoliberal endgames”.

Heidi Sohn
“I hate to say this, but this place is getting to me. I think I’m getting the Fear.”
(from the movie Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas, 1998)

Since the first decade of the 21st century, the Eurozone is facing financial and economic fluctuations that are shocking the core of their societies and threatens its consistency (i.e economic crisis of 2008 and the considerations of a ‘grexit’). The countries of the European Union are in a crisis, fact that challenges in multiple levels social claims of the last decades. Greece and especially Athens, as facing its 5th year of economic recession (Eurostat, 2012) constitutes an arena where the process of crisis is unfolding through several aspects of everyday life and that are visible in the city centre of Athens. The urban abandonment and the urban decay, the opposition and the simultaneous political obsolescence, the violence and social exclusion are some of the blueprints of the financial crisis in Athens. Financial packages followed by austerity programs, bring reaction and at the same time more suppression, forming a vicious circle of fear and disorientation in which society, unable to identify origins of the problem, is conflicting/attacking itself.

The Urban Asymmetries - Athens project has as a starting point the economic crisis and its effects in the physical space. The historical and urban analysis of Greece and Athens led to the statement that, Athens faces a immaterial and material transformation though which “the fear of otherness” and the social segregation emerge, forming “invisible boundaries”, in an urban environment until now “socially mixed”. Under these circumstances of suppression, i. the redefinition of the public realm is taking place, fact that is reflected from the accessibility on public services and common goods, or public spaces. ii. housing and ownership, important commodities for the Greek society, are under questioning.

The last decade Athens decision-making purchased the “global city model”, by not taking in to consideration the shifting realities in the core of the city. Therefore, certain social groups as immigrants, homeless and drug-addicts forming today an informal layer in the city, are not taken into account, remaining marginalized. Social margins and the “main body of the society”; develop inner-conflicts, and oppose their selves to the powers that orchestrate crisis. Athens is converted into a battlefield where the formal expressed through the institutionalized ideologies, the media’s ‘public opinion’; the demand for purism, the references to a nostalgic abstraction of the past, the “generalized conformism”, is opposing to the informal, the illegal, the non-legitimized, the “extremes”, the spontaneous reaction, the difference, fact that results in condition of generalized fear in the center of Athens.

In order to understand which events and actors have led to the current situation in Athens, we approached the current spatial issues from a historical context. Having as a starting point the loss of “centrality”, as it has been defined by Henri Lefebvre, we research on how the social, political and economic context have influenced and still influence the urban form, its processes and the individuals life that live in the city today. How finally the events, the global circumstances, the political decisions and the multiple actors on space have shaped the city? and from the other side, How we can identify subjectively through experience the city as a process defined by the tactics and the everydayness of the inhabitants. Which are the asymmetries or the conflicts in global, national, metropolitan, urban and intersocial level and how all these are forming the current shift in the center of Athens of the current system, the urban decay, are intensified due to the crisis.

We map, identify and correlate historical events and their outcomes, in order to trace alternatives to the current situation through a thorough research of the causes. The city is considered as an evolving socio-historical process which is not only the ramification of the action of other phenomena, but can be an actor itself. Since our specialization is urbanism and architecture, the goal of the project is to develop strategies binned under the same approach for urbanity and urban life. With our strategies, we want to trace alternatives and trigger the discussion on spatial issues, policies and counter-
strategies that aim to tackle uncertainty, inequality and fear. The spatial interrelation between material and immaterial changes and problems, (i.e. how the social changes are affecting the city) are worked out in the urban analysis and more specific in the five personal theory perspectives. The final aim is to conclude to five different proposals for space that can vary in scale and scope of influence, by remaining a counter-suggestions on the fear and loaning processes in Athens.

The final outcome of the research part of this graduation studio is a report that concludes with an approach for the city. This is the starting point for individual designs that have as a goal to change certain spatial circumstances in the city centre of Athens. The collective research is carried out to find a way in which we can intervene in the city. From this, the designs propose five possible interventions in the city. Parallel to the collective research we have individual proposals in which we elaborate a more theoretical perspective and which will be the starting point for a design. Our individual proposals contained an interest in an urban or architectonic issue. These issues, but not all of them, had also a location where this issue, e.g. ‘The representation of all groups of society in public space’, was reflected. In order to carry out a collective research the individual proposals were bound by one location which is Athens, Greece. The collective and individual research complement each other and influence each other through the research semester of this graduation studio.

The theme of the studio is the crisis situation that is developing in the Euro-zone nowadays. Athens is chosen as a location in order to see and do research on a city that faces an economic (and thus social) crisis. Our field of research is the shifting urban condition in Athens. We look on the one hand to the effects of the economic crisis and try to find on the other hand the kind of approach that is suitable in such a situation. This project is relevant in its aim to solve socio-spatial problems in cities at moments that ordinary planning instruments can’t be used, but the social-spatial issues are manifold. Under ordinary planning instruments can be understood, the implementation of a master-plan which needs a strong city organisation, big investments and the access of the municipality to property.

If we want to give a proper approach to the current situation we need to take into consideration the way in which this economic crisis originated and if so, to which level it has led to the situation of the city nowadays. A historical timeline is made in order to find out what the events and trends have been that have led to Athens as it is at this moment. Subjects are for example; change of building regulations, global economic events and the countries’ aim for the city. The research is carried out as a broad research on the history of Athens (from its start as a capital in 1830). The location of the research was until then specified only to the scale of the city. This is done in order to see what the issues are in the city without limiting ourselves to a specific neighbourhood.

The urban analysis complements the historical research by mapping the urban form and by the spatialization of social problems that we observe in the city. In order to get more specialised information, we use meetings and discussions with persons with different expertise in the field of architecture and urbanism in Athens; professors and researchers from the University of Athens. The visit to the city gives us information on the status of the built environment, e.g. abandoned buildings, closed shops, and phenomenological information like the atmosphere in areas of the city, the image inhabitants have about their neighbourhood, the feeling of fear and anger during protests, etc. The research on the regional scale together with the historical research will point out a more specific area in the city where we can relate our individual topics to actual things happening in the city.

We chose to focus our urban research on a square of the city centre which has no relation to real boundaries in the city. The reason we chose for this approach is because we want to focus on an area where borders of different areas meet. The first reason to take a sample out of the city is that the building type (polykatoikia) is spread over all over Athens (Woditsch, 2009 p:68 & own
observation) and by this we can't define neighbourhoods according to different building typologies, neither are they unified by the fact that an entire area is built as an entity in a certain limited time span. Due to this, the differences between areas are mostly experienced by the street profile, activity on the street and the state of the façade of the buildings. These streets and building blocks create a network that extends and doesn’t have clear boundaries, it is an entity. For this reason we didn’t want to chose boundaries as if they limit one area from another area while in reality there wasn’t such a limit. The second reason for the sample is that we focus on social problems in the city which are not bound to one area. We attempt to see where they are located. The starting point of the research came from the socio-spatial issues, due (and sometimes not due) to the economic crisis in Athens. For the research to be thoroughly done by five participants we chose to limit our research area. The urban analysis on the level of documentation of the city is done on the scale of the municipality of Athens, which is a smaller area within the entire city of Athens. More specific research about social problems are only done in the sample-square. The boundaries and form of the sample-square come forth from the observations of the group. In the areas that are included we observed multiple inequalities/parts of life in the city that are not in balance with other parts of life in the city. The form of a square indicates this theoretical boundary, it does not have a centre like a circle, neither does it show connections between points like a triangle. The purpose of the square is to limit a group of areas in order to have a spatial limit of the research.

The method we use to relate historical events is a timeline in which we trace five meta-topics (social, economics, etc). The timeline is used to give insight in the relations between events and to see their effect on the city that Athens is now. The conclusions are presented in maps and through statements that are the starting point for a collective approach. The conclusive maps as we call them show the events of history in space, in order to give a clear insight in the roots of the city as it functions now. The urban analysis is made in the form of plans which indicate spatial issues and problem areas. Parallel to the historical and urban research we conducted an individual problem statement that is the starting point for our individual interventions. With our designs we will propose the actions that need to take place in order to achieve the vision for the city as set out in the conclusions from our research.
What has led to the current situation of fear and loaning?

PROBLEM STATEMENT

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

URBAN ANALYSIS

CONCLUSIVE MAPS

VISION => APPROACH

CONTAINER CITY

STATEMENTS

LOCATION

SPECIFIC SPATIAL ISSUE

UNDERSTANDING OF SPATIAL POTENTIAL

5 POINTS OF ATTENTION IN THE CITY

DESIGNS FOR ATHENS

CENTRE OF ATHENS

SOCIO-SPATIAL PROBLEMS

14
STATEMENTS

- shifting role of the centre/uneven development between centre and periphery
- invisible boundaries/spatial intergraion - social segregation
- top-down decisions not responding to reality
- new actors/inhabitants not responding in the decision making
- new ways of uses/‘formal & informal’ uses
- redefinition of the public realm/gap between public and private

5 POINTS OF ATTENTION IN THE CITY

1. Enabling Complexity_An approach for the inclusion of migrants and refugees in the life of Athens
2. Questioning urban myths_In search for co-existence and integration in Athens
3. Segregated Communities_Refounding urban negotiation
4. Making the “invisible” visible_A re-activation strategic project starting with the invisible groups and the spatial formation of the area, using a neighborhood as the activator unit
5. Conflicting realities of the “invisibles”_Redefining abandonment in Athens
Strategy

Strategy can be defined as a systematic plan of actions and the connections between them. A strategy is a group of actions which, thanks to the establishment of a place of power (the property of the proper), elaborate theoretical places (systems and totalizing discourses) capable of articulating and assemble of physical places in which forces are distributed. Strategy privilege spatial relationships. It converts temporal relations to spatial ones through the analytical attribution of a place to each particular element and is organized by the postulation of power. In a more theoretical aspect, a strategy creates places in conformity with abstract models. According to Bourdieu’s theory, strategies in general form a field of operations within which the production of theory also takes place.

Strategic planning

The term strategic planning can be described as a mixture of thought, tools and expertise. It can be defined as the identification of the conflicts and the problems in an area, the actors that take part in them and finally the tools used to address them.

Tactic

Tactic is a calculated system of actions, determined by the absence of a proper locus, which provides it with the condition necessary for autonomy. A tactic operates in isolated actions and is determined by the absence of power just as a strategy is organized by the postulation of power.

Actor

A person or an organization taking a significant part in an urban process, by deciding and attempting to implement its decisions and approaches and at the same time maintaining its acting power.

Agent

Human agency is considered to be the capacity of human beings to make choices and implemented to their surrounding environment. An agent could potentially become an actor, though a form of potential power is necessary in order to evolve as one.

Urban decay

The process and the product associated with economic decline, poverty, poor management and maintenance, and obsolete buildings.

Urban policy

The attempts and the proposals made in order to control and manage the forces shaping urban areas.

Public realm

The parts of the city that are available without charge, for everyone to see, use and enjoy, including (but not limited to) streets, squares and parks, public and civic building, facilities and services; all land to which everyone has ready, free and legal access 24 hours a day. A non-private arena of social life and interaction.

Privitization

The transfer of public responsibility (such as a local authority’s development control service or any public...
service) or public assets (such as public buildings) to private ownership for exploitation.

**Neoliberalism**

Neoliberalism is an entirely new paradigm for economic theory and policy-making – the ideology behind the most recent stage in the development of capitalist society. Neoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices. The state has to guarantee, for example, the quality and integrity of money. It must also set up those military, defense, police and legal structures and functions required to secure private property rights and to guarantee, by force if need be, the proper functioning of markets. Furthermore, if markets do not exist (in areas such as land, water, education, health care, social security, or environmental pollution) then they must be created, by state action if necessary. But beyond these tasks the state should not venture. State interventions in markets (once created) must be kept to a bare minimum because, according to the theory, the state cannot possibly possess enough information to second-guess market signals (prices) and because powerful interest groups will inevitably distort and bias state interventions (particularly in democracies) for their own benefit.
Since the 19th century and the formation of the Greek nation-state, Greece is struggling to define its political and social identity, mainly by detaching itself from the orientalism of the Ottoman Empire and by aiming to become part of the West, a Modern European State. This ambitious project, starts from the very beginning of the modern-Greek history (1830 Protocol of London and the independent state), runs along with and defines in the same time the socio-historic processes taking place in this geographical area until today. By simply changing name, Westernization, Modernization, Industrialization, Europeanization, Globalization, and Flexibilization it describes the imposed and emerged shifts, visions and decisions or it emerges as a panacea that cures the mis-functioning or dead-ends of each previous period. The following text aims on tracing the socio-historical evolution of the city of Athens from 1830 until today under and simultaneously on unpacking the current crisis condition in Athens though this process of “-ization”.

Image 2: cartoon on the eurocrisis from Hugo Freutel, 2010
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Fear and Loaning in Athens

Dualism or Hinge?

A “Bi-polar” Character of Athens urbanization process.

The only part of the so-called national wealth that actually enters into the collective possession of a modern nation is the national debt.

—Karl Marx, Capital vol. 1

Introduction

Since the 19th century and the formation of the Greek nation-state, Greece is struggling to define its political and social identity, mainly by detaching itself from the orientalism of the Ottoman Empire and by aiming to become part of the West, a Modern European State. This ambitious project, starts from the very beginning of the modern-Greek history (1830 Protocol of London and the independent state), runs along with and defines in the same time the socio-historic processes taking place in this geographical area until today. By simply changing name, Westernization, Modernization, Industrialization, Europeanization, Globalization, and Flexibilization it describes the imposed and emerged shifts, visions and decisions or it emerges as a panacea that cures the mis-functioning or dead-ends of each previous period. The following text aims on tracing the socio-historical evolution of the city of Athens from 1830 until today under and simultaneously on unpacking the current crisis condition in Athens though this process of “-ization”.

Tracing the urban processes (1833-2012):

During the 19th century the Eastern Question and the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire, the redistribution of power in Eastern Europe and the expansion of political and economic influence towards East, were crucial issues for the future geopolitical map of Europe. For these reasons, Greek revolution and the formation of the Greek State was supported in multiple ways by Western European forces. The Greek independency, apart from its semiology (revival of the ancient Greek ideals, romanticism and revolutionary movements of that period), was regarded as a chance for speculation of a terra incognita until then. Therefore, the period of the Greek revolution and the first years of independency was the period in which political, financial and cultural bonds started to develop and intensified.

It could be said that the Greek Revolution of 1821 and the way to independency had created multiple dependencies with the West. More precisely, the revolution had its ideological origins in French Revolution and liberalism, supported by Greek bourgeoisie of the local agricultural Orthodox population and resulted into an absolute Monarchy leaded by an imposed Bavarian Prince, Otto, who was selected to organize and be in command of Greece had chosen Athens (1833) as the capital mainly because of its historical importance. During his years it was tried to convert Athens from a small village of 4000 inhabitants into a European city. Big plans from Kleanthis-Schaubert and architectural projects made by foreign architects change sharply the tissue of the city. According to Samiagiannis (2000), the above mentioned plans were part of the Westernization process, which was accepted by the local bourgeois class1 but mainly was imposed by European forces. This process continued during the years of King George II when the urban identity of the city center was steadily formed2.

Despite of the ambitions for the formation of a European Capital, the population and generally the economy remained agrarian. Thus, during the period of the Second Industrial Revolution in Europe, Greece was still an economy based mainly in agriculture and farming (64% and 12.2% accordingly) and less in commerce (12%). It is only in 1880’s when Greece experienced its preliminary capitalist phase. During that period, ambitious infrastructural projects3, financed by loans given by British Banks, started. Although that fast-

1 Greece even before its independency owed the sum of $15,000,000 to British banks.
2 As far as Greek economy remained agrarian based of the feudalism, bourgeois class has not been formed yet. The role of the local bourgeois class was taken from Greek merchants and ship-owners of Diaspora.
3 Projects as the Academia, the New Palace, Zappeio, the National Technical University of Athens, Polytechneio are some of the flag projects designed by European architects during the first 50 years. Ministries, Military fields (eastern from the palace) and Police (western from Palace) complete the image of the New Capital. From 1870’s the first suburbs design (Patissia). It could be said that these developments depict the western influence and the tendencies for expelling or erasing everything related to the past. Order and control (boulevards, Palaces, Military Services and Police) replaced the “anarchy” of the Ottoman years.
4 Expansion of the railway and road system, first industrial activities around Athens. To that point it has to be mentioned that the first Greek banks are founded.
development period lasted only until the bankruptcy of 1893, some bases for further modernization and the rise of bourgeois class, were set. The economic crisis of 1890’s followed by a nationalist regime, resulted to a disastrous War, a large indemnity and a Financial Control Council imposed by Europe, a fact that created further dependencies with the European forces⁵.

To that point it has to be mentioned that until the beginning of the 20th century Greece struggles between its feudalist-leftover and its modern capitalistic future, always being dependent on foreign capital. Thus, after the war with Turkey several shifts in political forces, a second phase of modernization of a post-feudal Greek state is about to start, which is doom to stay incomplete. Further loans for the restructuring of the military⁶ and the state and important reforms in distribution of land, social security and industrialization⁷. It is the period that bourgeois class gets the power and starts the effort to convert Greece into a modern capitalist state and simultaneously the period of emerged social demands. Expansive wars towards north-east had as a result the increase of population and the expansion of the public land. With a top-down approach reforms in civil services in land distribution⁸ and industrialization were introduced and a preliminary welfare state slightly appeared. At the same time, the top-down decision making of the state is been reflected in the top-down planning for Athens⁹: New public works program of roads, railway, tram construction, public services buildings and banks, reforms concerning the administration and the institutions related to planning and architecture (Architecture School, Ministry of Public Developments and Infrastructure, Technical Association) and from the other side projects mainly for the new born bourgeois class (housing, recreation and industries). On the rise of the 20th century Athens had an important increase of its population, therefore the plans for the expansion of the city were necessary. However, the plans were focusing in the “official” and formal city-center, staying indifferent in front of the rise of informal settlements installed in several spots around center¹⁰. This kind of approach, formed finally a reality parallel to the formal part/society/economy of the city that defined finally the evolution and the city form.

Liberals under Venizelos, were striving to create a modern capitalist state, a country with a certain national Greek-identity¹¹ that would not have any connection with its oriental past and will be able, if not to compete, but to participate equally in the European affairs. It was only in the 20th century, when Greece - mainly Athens- had a self-sustained bourgeois class mainly consisting of ship-owners and merchants. The more intense industrialization of the state started mainly after the Balkan Wars¹². To that point it has to be mentioned that the lag in industrial accumulation (or generally the lag in time in the industrialization of the county) is either a “peculiarity of a developed production where non-competitive means of production co-exist” (Milios 2000, in Gkialis) or is related to the “comprador character” of the emerged bourgeois (Leondidou 1990, in Gkialis) and dependency to foreign capital. It is only after 1922 the end of the expansion war and the exchange of population in Asia Minor, that a capitalistic way of production thrived.

The Asia Minor population exchange constitute one of the most important events of the modern Greek History that defined in multiple ways the socio-economic, political and cultural structure of the country. After the end of the period of the “Greek-Imperialism” ¹³

---

⁵ According to J. Koliopoulos, T. Veremis (2010) the Greek State was forced pay a large war indemnity and in the same time to accept the long term control of the International Financial Control Committee. Under the pressure of the foreign dept and the International Control, the state was forced to take more loans, a fact that led to the assignment of sources of public revenue to creditors and the generation of monopolies.

⁶ During that time, the Greek military services were increased dramatically and the Greek army was restructured by French and British specialists.

⁷ The rise of the 20th century is the period that bigger industries are installed in the south-western part, close to the axis connecting Athens and Piraeus.

⁸ The redistribution of land started during 1880’s with the first subdivision of the large feudal estates. However this process has been intensified only in the beginning of 20th century and the agrarian reform proposed by E. Venizelos. The subdivision of land and the loans provided for this reason, gave the possibility to people working as farmers to become landowners.

⁹ The western influence is evident in the plans of that period since European Planners and Architects executed these projects.

¹⁰ Illegal encroachments started to develop since the foundation of the Capital (see. Anafiotika, Neapoli, Gazi). Since the urbanization was in process and people migrated to Athens. However, due to the lack of state housing policies, people were forced to claim land, build a shelter and install their family there.

¹¹ An example that can depict the intentions concerning a Greek identity are reflected even in the Constitution of 1911 (when the Greek language became the official language of the state). This demand for a pure modern Greek identity is related to the fact that during the first decades of 20th century areas culturally mixed became part of the country (see. Macedonia, Thrace), thus Greek was considered to be everybody adopting the Greek culture.

¹² According to Gialis (2006) inflation, currency devaluation and State regulation created favorable circumstances for the industrialization of that period.

¹³ From 1912 to 1922, Greece started an expansive war against Turkish Empire. Main aim of the expansion was since the Turkish Empire was to
expansion, Greek capital repatriation took place. At the same time the inflow of cheap and skilled labour and the financial crisis of 1929, had finally a positive influence on the industrial economy and growth. Therefore, the staffing of the industrial domain had been made mainly by refugees, which started forming after some years a powerful working class.

At the same time, Greece faced extreme problems in providing land and shelter to the refugees. In Athens and Piraeus, where more than 220,000 refugees arrived, thus the housing demands increased sharply. For this reason 12 and 34 minor refugees neighborhoods were created around the city-center (1-4 km away from the city) mainly in the west, close to the industrial activities or close to queries. At the same time industries started to be installed in a proximity to refugees neighborhoods. Along with the above mentioned plans new planned areas were created to host middle incomes (ilioupoli) and garden-cities located in the north were proposed for the upper classes. Although, socio-spatial segregation between east and west areas was evident since the Ottoman years, this is the period that the boundaries are becoming more clear. From the one side areas with no supportive infrastructure (transport, water supply, electricity) and plan disconnected from the center, suffering from sanity problems and from the other side ideal garden-cities, well planned with high quality services for their inhabitants.

The Mid-War period for Greece was characterized by political instability (1918-1936: twenty-two governments and eight coups) thus, refugees dissolved, claiming land and interest in the East was important for Greece—but for the dominant countries of the west. However the terms “Greek Imperialism” characterize in the same time a period that starts in 1821 and the Greek revolution, has been intensified in the first decades of 20th century and resulted in the “population exchange” and Treaty of Lausanne (definition of the national boundaries).

A lot of refugees coming from Asia Minor, used to be successful merchants or craftsmen.

The economic crisis of 1929 had a result the decrease of Greek immigration towards USA. Besides, agriculture domain was beaten first (exports of agriculture products). Industrial domain, very limited until that period, was influenced less and much later. That period the cheap labour (refugees or workers that could not migrate abroad for job) emerged as an opportunity.

According to K. Tsoukalas (1986) during 1930's, Greece was the third country internationally, after USSR and Japan, in terms of economic development.

The areas of Tauros, Drogouti, Harokopou, Piraeus, Koridalos, Kokkinia, Keratsini, Drapetsona

Nea Ionia, Nea Filadelfia, Nea Chalkidona, Peristeri, Aigaleo

During the years of Ottoman Empire, the eastern parts were habituated by Muslims-Turks and the western ones either by Christian Orthodox or from Muslims gypsies.

Refugees Rehabilitation Committee was an organization, under international, which was founded after the Protocol of Geneva in 1923. This Committee having the State support, organize the rehabilitation -housing and employment- of the refugees coming from Asia Minor. This organization, consisted of one American, one European and two Greek representatives, had its base in Athens.

The financial support provided by the State was part of the loans of 1924 and 1926 provided by British and US American Banks (Samuel Hambro Bank Ltd) with high interests. The budget provided for the new residencial areas, were distributed unequally between housing projects (91%) and infrastructural projects (3,87%) (Gizelli, 1984: in Belidakis 2011). Therefore, the concentration of refugees in single-function areas, with low quality standards, in distance from the center and without the necessary infrastructural support, were areas doomed to be marginalized.

According to Leonidou (1989) illegal encroaching constitute a practice applied from upper class (proto-bourgeois) landowners even in the very first phase of Athens urbanization and from the labour class or refugees that had arrived in Athens in 1920's.

20 Refugees Rehabilitation Committee

Reference:


Gizelli, P. (1984). The financial support provided by the State was part of the loans of 1924 and 1926 provided by British and US American Banks (Samuel Hambro Bank Ltd) with high interests. The budget provided for the new residencial areas, were distributed unequally between housing projects (91%) and infrastructural projects (3,87%) (Gizelli, 1984: in Belidakis 2011). Therefore, the concentration of refugees in single-function areas, with low quality standards, in distance from the center and without the necessary infrastructural support, were areas doomed to be marginalized.

22 According to Leonidou (1989) illegal encroaching constitute a practice applied from upper class (proto-bourgeois) landowners even in the very first phase of Athens urbanization and from the labour class or refugees that had arrived in Athens in 1920's.
The Mid-War period for Greece is the period that another division “threatens” society. The rise and reinforcement of the communist ideas with the simultaneous repression from the dictatorial forces of Metaxas or the opposition by the Monarchists, formed a socio-political conflict evident until the restoration of Democracy in 1975. The rise of Communism in Greece concerned the countries of the west, and mainly Great Britain which intervened in the Civil War for suppressing the left forces. This concern would be more evident only after the end of World War II, the Treaty of Yalta (1945) and the “spheres of influence” agreement between the winners of the World War II.

It could be said that the period of Mid-War constitutes just a preparatory/preliminary phase for the patterns of the urbanization processes, the economic development, the social and political structure as these were expressed after World War II. It is the period that dependencies with the West (political, financial and cultural) were intensified and references from the East merged into something new. In the same time it is the period an economic crisis led to a further depression of the population.

From 1940 to 1949, Greece passed through a World War, the fascist occupation and the Civil War. In the beginning of that period, the elected Greek government moved to Egypt, a Hitler's Quisling regime was imposed and the guerrilla communist movements, which later became the independent government, started to organize and oppose their selves to the imposed forces. The Greek economy was devastated, since German trusts and big companies exploited mines and queries (raw material for the war). The urban areas and especially Athens, was threatened by famine, since the agricultural production was exploited by the Nazi Powers.

After the end of World War II, under the fear of Communism, the Allies tried to intervene in politics of the country, converting it into a “protectorat”. (Sarrigiannis, 2000). More precisely, Great Britain being afraid of the communist expansion in an area with multiple interests (previous loans, loan of 1946, future developments and strategic points) started controlling political decisions through key-personalities in the administration. This game of powers over the Greek space resulted disastrously, since a society struggling for its independency from 19th century was led to a schism that could not be recovered easily. Again, the society seemed divided between East (communism) and West (capitalism). Traces of the period of WWII and Civil War, are mainly part of the collective memory of the city (stories, myths related to places) and it could be said that these narratives defined the social structure and the clashes of the following period.

In 1950’s the effort for economic and social reconstruction of the county started. After World War II and the Civil War, Greece was a country devastated, suffered by incalculable material damage to its infrastructure and its agricultural and industrial activities. During the reconstruction period, USA support replaced the British influence of the previous years. From 1947 till 1953 financial support of 2,2 million dollars was provided to the state through the Truman Dogma and the Marshall Plan for the reconstruction of infrastructure (ports, roads, trains). However, emphasis was given to military equipment and defense systems. In 1951 the Plan for the Future Economic Development of the country has been edited by Varvaresos who supported that industrial production could not be efficient enough for the case of Greece and that the construction domain could be the future direction. More precisely, he declared that the construction domain could boost “Greek- entrepreneurship” provide job opportunities, covering at the same time the housing demands of the people in urban areas. According to his statements, this direction can be the best example for “introducing welfare state practices which take into consideration the poorest classes” fact that “will inflict important damage upon Communist intentions for the Country.”(Varvaresos 1951 in Sarrigiannis 2000).

It could be said that the above plan proposed by Varvaresos, reflects the concern about “Communist Threat” that was still existing in Greece. According to economic analysts of that period, the non development of the industrial domain will maintain the dependencies of the country from foreign capital. However, the dominant political power winners of the Civil War, believed that the industrial concentrations should be avoided because of the thread of a revolt. On the contrary, a small scale construction economy could create better circumstances for the control of the population. At the same time the de-regulation of housing through small scale construction companies and capital was covering the lack of welfare state policies regarding housing for the majority of the population26. The directions for the

---

24 Siemens-Halske, Ulen & Co, The power and Traction Finance Cie Ltd and others.

25 Over one-quarter of the entire working class was unemployed while the living costs had increased twenty-fold in four years.
economic development and urbanization processes were intertwined to each other. However, in the case of Greece the focus is on the construction domain (housing) that intensified simultaneously the economic and the urbanization process, since the densification of the built environment meant economic expansion and profit.

The above mentioned ideas, with the necessary revisions on the building regulation of the 1930’s 28 in combination with the small landownership28 created a fruitful ground for the rapid urbanization and the increase of the population to start and defined the image and form of the Athenian urbanity. Due to the emphasis given to the construction of single buildings, planning was neglected. This fact led to the hyper-exploitation of urban space and into the formation of high density neighborhoods29. Housing started to become a main commodity for the people. This is still present in Athens and in every Greek city.

During the post-war period a car had become a commodity too. Several decisions concerning the infrastructure of Athens, in combination with older western trends about the car use, led to the actual dependency from the car. The few possibilities for using public transport 30 or the tendencies depicted in the public projects, as the design of big axes, influenced the increased use of private car. The urbanization of the population, the trends for decentralization, the informalization of the periphery of the city (illegal encroaching), and the steady increase of the average income converted house and car ownership into indispensable elements of urban life.

According to the plans of the early 1950’s, the industrial domain should be developed more on the periphery and not attached to big agglomerations. However, the emphasis was given to the housing and construction domain and on the infrastructural projects. It was only in the 1960’s, when the economy started recovering, that the heavy industrialization intensified in national level and zones were formed as part of a National Strategic Plan. In Athens this tendency was expressed through the decentralization of industrial functions on the West. This intensified the division of Attica in Eastern and Western districts. Besides, the industrial zones influenced the urbanization processes and the illegal settlement expansion on the West of the periphery. As it has been mentioned above, the distinction between East and West was evident since the 18th century. The city however remained socially mixed due to the system of polykatoikia and the fact that an important percentage of the population possessed land which could be given to a small developer, that could be expropriated with apartments. The co-habitation of owners and renters in the same building established a certain social mixture, due to the variety of apartments in one building.

In the late 1960’s people had vivid memories of the Civil War and thus the conflict was still existing. From 1967-1974 a Military Junta came into power after a coup d’état that, according to Hobsbawn (1999), was the only (extreme right) regime in Europe imposed with the support of USA. During that period the city of Athens became even more dense and previous labour areas in the periphery were rebuilt according to the model of polykatoikia. More precisely, the increase on heights for already built houses constitute a “gift” to real estate owners, since extra taxation was not necessary (Mantouvalou, 2010 in ). On the other hand high taxation was imposed in older-built blocks, thus the massive production of housing was still more profitable.

From the end of the Civil War until the end of the dictatorship the actual urban form of the city was more or less defined. The city was rapidly urbanized through a process of embourgeoisement of the rural population31. The demand for social and economic

back the investor by granting him some apartments.  
27 The system of granting and the building regulations of 1955 that allowed higher heights and defined the typology of polykatoikia.  
28 After the independency the land owned by the Empire or big landowners or the Orthodox Church had to be redistributed. In the case of Athens, wealthy Greeks or Europeans living abroad started speculating land before even the announcement that Athens would become the Capital of the State. From the end of 19th century until the first decades of 20th century, several reforms had been done by the state in order a redistribution of land to several owners to happen. The subdivision of land meant that more people had their individual piece of land to cultivate (in peripheral cities or in rural areas) or to build their houses. After the War and the introduction of the granting system, people possessing land with the support of a small developer, could “exchange” land with one or more apartments.  
29 Characteristic examples of this process are the areas of Kypseli, Patissia on the northern part of the city-center.  
30 The lack of projects concerning public transport during the period 1945-1955 and the low quality private transport and the stop of the tram in the late 1950’s, the densification and the expansion of the city in combination with the existence of proposed big axes are some of the factors that converted the inhabitants of Athens into car users (or car consumers). Important role into that shift played the research made by Wilbur Smith and Associates in 1963 according to which car transportation is more efficient than public transport commuting. It has to be mentioned that 1960’s but mainly after the crisis of 1970’s, this model was contested in several European cities.

31 By providing employment, mainly in the service domain (expansion of the public sector and construction domain), and an apartment rural population changed rapidly its everyday life, becoming part of urban life.
security, constituted a way to preserve the political stability, thus the massive production of housing or the development of the construction domain was a way to reassure the majority of people and to convince them about the political correctness of the system. However, it has to be mentioned that part of the society was totally neglected, either hidden in dense areas of the city or in peripheral neighborhoods, excluded from the public realm or exiled.

The restoration of democracy came only in 1974, after strong reactions and social movements forged during the years after the war and intensified during dictatorship. The period of the late 1970's and 1980's is the first time from 19th century that people feel independent from any foreign power, equal and free to express themselves. This is the period that Greece becomes a member of the EU (1981) and later of the Eurozone (2001). In has to be mentioned that this process had started during 1970's but due to the military regime the proposal was not accepted by the European Union.

Concerning Athens, the general building regulation and the master plans for the city, could not cover all the dimensions and the layers of the city. In fact, the general direction and infrastructural plans and from the other site a deregulated housing production based on the small investors, were never intertwined to each other. Thus, they could not address to the real complexity of Athens. In the same time the subsequent changes of the regulations and the difficulties in the implementation process led to a point that urban planning was about to be reviewed. The legal framework of 1979 concerning “residential areas” reflects a shift from general masterplans to more specific, smaller scale planning, that were still top-down though. The urbanization process of the previous decades was massive and without the necessary control. This made the regulation and control of space necessary through a framework; a set of tools and instruments of planning.

The post-war urbanization process, the informalization of the areas around the city core and its legalization in

---

32 The re-action towards the regime was expressed through squats in the Law School of the University of Athens (1971) and the National Polytechnic School (1973). The constitutional term of the asylum of the universities was the starting point of these reactions and for this reason University is part of the collective memory. After the dissolution of the military regime, universities constitute places in the city very much connected with any manifestation. In 2012 the of this idea came, after long discourse about “security”.

33 The legalization of arbitrary shelters became a populist policy about space, since the owners of these settlements were seen as potential voters. The legal framework concerning illegal settlements, combination with a car-based approach of the city, had several aftermaths to the natural and urban environment. Therefore, regulations concerning natural preservation had been made. This was probably influenced by the international discourse of the 1970’s concerning environment and heritage. However, these tendencies are more evident in the regulatory plan of 1985, which opened the discussion about sustainability.

It was the first time in the history of planning in Greece, for a long-term vision which aimed in balancing the aftermaths of the previous period and adapting to the European tendencies and provisions. The aims of this plan were focused on: heritage preservation, neighborhoods revitalization and improvement/ legalization of the neighborhoods (mainly in the west). However, during the power of small landowners or actors of the construction economy were still very important. This was fact that created several difficulties in the implementation. Besides, the economic recession of the late 1970’s and 1980’s and the demographic stagnation influenced the character of the proposals and their implementation (Maloutas, 2009). By observing the expansion of the city and the suburbanization during that period, it can be said that these plans were badly implemented either because they were not widely accepted or because of their occasional character.

The period of the 1990’s is that of “growth” when the vision of “modernization” was to be accomplished. During that period, Greece improved its finances and developed rapidly. This is the period of low loan interest, when everybody could have certain fluidity and invest. it is the period of Stock market bubble. After Greece entered into the Euro-Zone, only some years before the Olympic Games of Athens this “growth” process entered to its final stage.

The concern about environmental problems led from 1992 to the decentralization of activities from the centers of Athens and Piraeus. The planning proposal boosted again the construction domain, since 4 peripheral centers (Marousi, Xaidari, Elliniko, Menidi), attached to big axes-connectors with the center, became the new field for development. The specific policy, led to the was introduced in 1983 and reviewed in 2011.

34 The regulatory plan of 1985 included one of the first proposals for the regeneration of central areas through urban design projects related to the historic center and its identity.

35 Legal framework, reforms and planning were reviewed almost after every electoral change.

36 “Growth” and “Modernization” were the key words of the political discourse of the 1990’s.
suburbanization of Athens, since it gave the possibility to inhabitants, possessing a certain capital, leaving the dense center and purchasing “quality of life” in the suburbs. During the 1990's the circumstances were good for such a direction because the economy was growing and future perspectives for development, such as the Olympic Games organization and the Euro-Zone project, were having a positive impact, creating at the same time the necessary impression of security to people who invest on real estate. This is the period that the bank system is becoming more powerful, providing private loans with very low interest.

However, the suburbanization of Athens would not be that successful in the beginning if the dissolution of USSR would not have happened. More specifically, from the late 1980's but mainly in the 1990's an important amount of immigrants from the Balkan peninsula and the Black Sea arrived in the country. These new inhabitants were being installed in the most dense areas of the city center due to the lack of money, replacing the previous tenants which left the center. Therefore, the first immigration flow gave the possibility to old tenants to have an extra-income by renting to immigrants and live in the suburbs themselves.

The possibilities for development and investment on the outskirts and the demand for a suburban lifestyle influenced the sprawl of the city and simultaneously the surrounding natural environment. More precisely, from the mid-1990's until 2006, almost every summer the peripheral forests of Attica were on fire. Due to the lack of any control and environmental consciousness, the ex-forestall land was easily renamed into urban or suburban land, a fact that finally highlighted fire as a tool for speculation.

The period of intense suburbanization and sprawl of the city of Athens, coincided with the preparations for the Olympic Games, an event of national importance which was indented to become the key project for the evolution of the city. However, the spatial organization of Olympic Games project was not part of a Regulatory Plan/Masterplan or a strategy. That means that in the name of “development” or “common interest”, public and private sector could intervene and implement projects easier and in a more flexible way. The program for Olympic Athens concerned projects in multiple scales, however finally the mega-projects were the main focus. Emphasis was given on the peripheral centers where the sports activities would be located and in the connection between them, the airport and secondly with the center of Athens. Two new metro lines, tramline, a ring road connecting East and West and a new international airport were realized. According to Maloutas (2009), these projects were part of the Transnational European Networks policy through which the EU promoted the construction of infrastructure for the market unification process. Besides, for the EU, these projects would emerge as a new opportunity for western-European construction companies that could supplant their smaller in size Greek counterparts (Maloutas, 2009).

Concerning the center, the realized projects were focusing on the beautification of Athens by highlighting its historical identity and not in interventions that would have an impact on the quality of life in the center. It could be said that the emphasis given on the peripheral centers shifted the gravity points in the city and emerged a further decentralization of the activities from the center and triggered the sprawl of the city.

The end of the Olympic Games, apart from an important debt for the county, left behind huge interventions that had to reused. The official vision for Post Olympic Athens was to become a ‘competitive city’ able to seize all the opportunities that Olympic Games had created. Therefore, the re-use of Olympic venues was indented to contribute to the economic development and the urban regeneration of Athens through activities of culture, leisure, sports and tourism. These poles would have a twofold role. Firstly, they would attract international investments and tourists and secondly they would satisfy the local demands for entertainment and shopping. In the above mentioned project the role of the state is even more shrieked, since the patterns defined the last years (PPP), had been seen as more efficient for the state since public sector faced serious fiscal constraints.

This ambitious project (Olympic and post-Olympic Athens) has changed the way that urban planning is implemented. In fact, instead of planning or strategy, dispersed mega-projects and their interconnection had

37 In the beginning the private loans were mainly loans for housing. However as the economy became even more immaterial, loans had been given for any possible consumer demands.

38 Apart from the unification of archeological sites and the industrial park in Gazi and some the projects in Piraeus street, the most of the projects were proposed a temporal solutions others have not been completed yet.

39 Due to their scale and their typology these building could not be easily re-used and become part of the daily program of the city. Some of them were sold or rented to become Malls, some others host now public services that they used to be located in the centre, others were rented for events and leisure or sports activities.

40 According to Maloutas (2009) , the dispersed character of the interventions was the result of established urban design practices
been made. More precisely, the lack of a general strategy and long term plan, formed a fragmented character of these interventions. The vision, focused on the regional scale, was to position Athens into the global hierarchy for cities and convert it into a competitive pole in South-East Europe (or in Balkan Peninsula). However, the Olympic Games project, instead of opportunities, has created further financial dependencies with European Union and International banks. These dependencies, the global financial crisis and the recession of the Greek economy define the pattern of the current economic crisis.

In 21st century, Athens intended to become a global destination attracting investors and tourists. For this reason, after 2004, the peripheral poles were reinforced by absorbing activities from the center which was designated to become a cultural-leisure attractor. Policies and decisions on urban space led to an uneven development between the center and the periphery. The city-center, having more or less the same structure since 1970, and without any radical intervention in the neighborhood scale, could not satisfy the demands of the city and thus was neglected. The last decade, but mainly after the Olympic Games, the mixed-use, dense, low-urban quality areas of the center became the place for the more marginalized parts of the society to be installed. The low quality of housing and public space came along with the decrease in interest and land value, in combination with social issues. At the same time the political instability in countries of Asia and Africa had as a result a second immigration wave in Greece and mainly in Athens. The centralized bureaucratic Greek administration system, the lack of policies concerning immigration and the bad implementation of the existing ones, led to the socio-spatial segregation of these groups in the city center.

The period after Olympic games is characterized by a social reaction taking place. Problems such as unemployment, poverty, were existent even during the period of growth however after 2004 they became evident, influencing a larger part of the society. Protests concerning the constitution review, or reforms on the education, police violence and the rise of extreme parties had shown that the Athenian society demands for radical change. The city has to deal with the reality of the post-Olympic period, that contains features brought by policies, actions, events and influences from the modern and recent past of the Greek state, which shaped Athens of 2012.

The center has been the last years part of a discourse about the future of Athens. Several proposals concerning the historical center have been made by the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change before 2009 in collaboration with the Technical University of Athens or other non-profit organizations. Some of them were focused on the revitalization of deteriorated areas of the center, others seem more like urban regeneration projects related to the gentrification of the city. However, from the moment that Greece entered under the financial control of the Troika (IMF, European Central Bank, European Commission) all these projects and generally public and private interest decreased. To that point it is worth asking which could be the future scenario about Athens. Which could be the image of the city and the social structure of the centre. Would the “chaos” emerge speculation based on existing models or would it conclude to a failure of these models and the rise of alternative ways of urban inhabitance and co-existence?

**General Conclusions:**

- Dependencies and influences-financial, cultural, political- from western advanced economies are always existing but they transform according to the global, national or local circumstances.
- Athens as a hinge or a bipolar city between east and west Europe?
- Tendencies in delay (i.e. industrial capitalism came after urbanization.)
- Tendencies imposed or easily adopted not always important percentage of immigrants enter the boundaries of Greece.

---

41 Apart from the promotion of infrastructure projects, partly financed by the EU, promoted structural reforms for the realization of these projects, as PPPs or private supervision of the projects. The main objective of these reforms was 1. to increase the “efficiency” 2. to decrease the public funds by engaging private sector.

42 Drug addiction: The issue with the drug use in public space has been intensified after 2004. More precisely, it has been observed that detoxification services - based in providing subsidies as methadone-installed in the center had as consequence drug trafficking and use in some public spaces of the center.

Prostitution: Is legal under certain provisions., The illegal prostitution was intensified just before the Olympic Games probably because of a fast-track temporal prostitution legalization or because of reasons related to global trafficking network (Athens as an arrival city of EU).

43 The high concentration of immigrants in Athens is related to 1. Athens the biggest agglomeration of Greece providing certain opportunities or anonymity. 2. The bureaucratic procedures that immigrants have to follow after entering the country, are only concentrated in Athens. 3. The port of Piraeus, is the biggest port in Greece and it has direct connections to the small islands, where an important percentage of immigrants enter the boundaries of Greece.
emerged from the specific context.

Planning processes:

• Planning focus on the formal and the official neglecting bottom-up dynamics.
• Bottom up dynamics- massive informalization-legalization and patronage.
• Bad Planning implementation due to the 1. not engagement with society 2. powerful stakeholders/local elites.
• Mismatch between top-down plans and bottom-up interpretations.
• Spatial relation with the Public and the Common/ Lack of public and individualism.

After the historic analysis of the urbanization processes in Athens we conclude that there is a sum of peculiarities that makes European or US American models of economic development or urbanization patterns, to take different form in the specific context. Thus, to approach Athens we should focus on the peculiarities, the distortion upon the model or the rule.
Evolution of a building block/
εξέλιξη του οικοδομικού τετραγώνου
Image 4: Athens growing, 1960’s
Evolution of a building block

- 1830

1830 - 1910

1910 - 1930

1930 - 1950
max. cover | max. height | possible functions
---|---|---
no restriction | no restriction | no restriction

social structure & density
no restriction

max. cover | max. height | possible functions
---|---|---
no restriction | no restriction | residential

social structure & density
residential

1919 - 1934

Penthouse setback = 2.5m
Penthouse height = 4 m

1919: Hmax = 1.2 * street width
1922: Hmax = 1.75 * street width
1929: Hmax = 1.165 * street width

max. cover | max. height | possible functions
---|---|---
no restriction | no restriction | residential

social structure & density
residential

1934-1973

Penthouse height = 4 m
Penthouse setback = 2.5m

1934: Hmax = (2*street width)<18

max. cover | max. height | possible functions
---|---|---
no restriction | no restriction | residential

social structure & density
residential | residential | residential | residential | small commercial | crafts | storage
Fear and Loaning in Athens

1950 - 1970

1970 - 1990

1990 - 2012

2012 -
1955 - 1973

Minimum arcade height = 4 m
Minimum arcadewidth = 2.8 m

1955: $H_{\text{max}} = 2 \times \text{street width} < 24$

$H_{\text{max}} < 10 m^2$

1973 - 2000

Penthouse height = $H_{\text{max}} - H_f$
Penthouse setback = 2.5 m

1973: $H_{\text{max}} = 2 \times \text{street width} < 24$
1985: $H_{\text{max}} = 2 \times \text{street width} < 24$

1985-2000

Minimum arcade height = 3.5 m
Minimum arcade width = 2.5 m

2000: $H_{\text{max}} = 2 \times \text{street width} < 24$

Ownership timeline & public private timeline/
χρονική εξέλιξη της ιδιοκτησίας & χρονική εξέλιξη ιδιωτικού/δημοσίου
Shifting perspectives of space

Olympics → Museum
Timeline of ownership

**Under an Empire**
14th - 18th century / Feudalism (patrimonial system)

>> Private land owners sold their land to Greeks living in Europe. The church kept its privileges.
>> Transformation of the land tenure system and the subsequent deterioration of the position of the peasants.

**The creation of the state**
1830 / Redistribution of land

>> Redistribution of land and subdivision into smaller properties. Land was a tool for security and political stability.

**Designing a capital**
1833-1924 / Urban development & private property

>> The urban plans of Athens were hard to implement since there was opposition from political leaders and landowners.
Shifting perspectives of space

Living on the Outskirts
1923-... / Illegal encroachments & legalization

- Fast-track process for the habitation of refugees/illegal encroachment of land.
- Legalization of the refugees settlement by the state.

Development of Polykatoikia
1930-...

- Rapid urbanization process in Athens through the system of antiparochi(granting).
- Co-habitation of owners and renters in the same building.

Moving to the suburbs
1970-...

- The intense suburbanization process shows the desire of Athenian people to live outside of the city centre.
- Development of middle-class suburbs in the periphery of the city.
Image 5: timeline of private and public ownership in Athens
Shifting perspectives of space
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Conclusive maps/ Συμπερασματικοί χάρτες
The following pages show the conclusions from the timeline as conclusive maps. The conclusive maps are divided into periods, according to the means of production. The conclusive maps show under which conditions and by which influences the city was created and emerged.
Since 1830 Athens began transforming into the capital of the Greek State and the first industrial centre of the country. The process of this transformation was influenced by multiple tendencies and dependencies to the West. The plans and projects of the foreign architects prove the existence of an imposed development and role for the city. Almost all the transportation networks lead to the capital, making Athens a core that controls the production of the rest of the country. In that time Athens and Piraeus are two separate but interdependent cities.

As far as the urban development of the city is concerned, the pressures by politicians and the new land owners made the first masterplan of Athens collapse. The leaving Turkish population sold land to rich Greek bankers, merchants etc. As a result there is almost no public land in Athens, a fact that reinforces the private ownership as well as the dependency of the population to the meaning of owning land. Two decisions of that period would indicate the form of the later socio-spatial structure: first, the location of the palace to the east and the location of the first industries to the west of the city. At the same time, donations from the Greek Diaspora to the construction of new buildings and monuments (University, the Polytechnic School, the National Library and the Academy of Athens etc) brought craftsmen from the whole country to the city, which lived in self-built settlements located under the Acropolis.

Issues of ownership in the city scale as well as the attempt to promote Athens as capital in the state scale formed the path of development the city would follow in the future.
The urban development of the city follows the tendency of expansion of the already existing one around the two poles of Athens and Piraeus. There is a linear development along the axis that connects the two centers and towards a third one in the north: Kifissia.

The Athenian expansion was dominated by arbitrary building constructions, which later would be legalized as new urban regions. These new urban regions had almost no infrastructure connecting them to the city and popped up along with the inflow of refugees of the Minor Asia exchange population (these regions were located 2-10km from the limits of Athens Metropolitan plan- not influencing the social life of the capital). In the same time the new system of “granting” is being introduced and the issue of ownership is becoming crucial for the right of housing in the city.

Private interests mainly drove the expansion of the city, an effect of the subdivision of land that occurred during the previous era. Landowners had a significant role during the process of the city’s development counter to the state. This development can be characterized by fast replacement of the old tissue with the new one and the multiple expansions towards all directions.

LEGEND

- Human flow
- Plans for the centre of the city
- Urbanisation/ “polykatoikia” in the centre
- Immigrants arriving from the sea
- Regions where refugees settled
- Industries
- 1 plot
- Land owner
- Single house
Fear and Loaning in Athens

WEST:
(Paíri Gazi/ Metaksurgio/
Kolonos/ Sepolia/ Tavros/
Nes Ionia/ Perissos/ Egaleo/
Peristeri/ Haidari/ Menidi)

EAST:
(Kolonaki/ Syntagma/
Psichiko/ Filothel/
Kifisia/ Ekali)

Air pollution 70's
55%
28%
17%
Along with the growth of the city and the important wave of urbanization occurring in that era, the road infrastructure expanded as well. The system connecting the centre of the city with the outskirts promoted the use of cars and gradually diminished the use of public transport, making the private car an upper class good (in its early appearance) that everyone desires.

The traditional historic centre of Athens begins to decompose. Old houses are being demolished as the construction of "polykatoikia" is booming in the centre of the city. Illegal land appropriation and unregulated housing (fulfilling the demand for housing especially for the poor) was presented as "hubs of infection and criminality", which triggered actions of demolition of settlements particularly during the dictatorship. In the same time (1967-1974) symbols of repression and buildings of huge mass are being constructed (Police headquarters, War museum, the OTE building-National Telecommunications Headquarters, Tower of Piraeus) while the increased amount of industrial infrastructure constructions with no environmental restrictions, led to a significant deterioration of the natural environment.

At this time the city is obviously divided in two sides. There is a clear distinction between the industrial west and the richer/public-services-oriented east, which is expressed in the physical space through the density, the morphology of the buildings, access to commodities and quality of urban environment.
Fear and Loathing in Athens
The city is completed repleted. The gigantism of the city did not come along with the necessary infrastructure and policies for the quality of life in the city. The global oil crisis, the fall of the Greek military junta (1967-1974) and the entrance of Greece in the European Union influence the route of development of the country. Global oil crisis brought high inflation rates and increased unemployment while the entrance of Greece in the EU brings along limitations to the Greek production offering protection to the stronger EU countries-members. The countryside is being neglected and the contrast between Athens and the other cities is aggrandized.

The urban space has been commercialized and is used not only for use (residences, working spaces, etc) but also for investments and business that aim in maximizing their profit. It is obvious that during the 1990’s the gravity point changes from the free public spaces to privately owned ones (ex. Megaro Mousikis). Architecture, through the form of landmarks, comes first in the hierarchy instead of urban planning.

We can say that the use of the urban environment is influenced by the “exchange value” of the commodity and not by the “use value” anymore, borrowing the Marxist terminology. These tactics and intentions are expressed not only by private companies and businesses of that period but also by the majority of the population that owned land or an apartment anywhere in the city. Apartments in the polykatoikias in the city centre were inhabited mainly by elderly people, students and immigrants in the lower floors which were paying rent to the upper-middle class living in the suburbs.

13R. Peet, Theories of Development, page 149
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From the early 1990's the economy is based on the tertiary/service sector, which asks for more space in the city. Real estate has become the core factor of economic development, a fact that influences the urban and regional development. The immigration wave that arrived in the city managed to be incorporated by working in constructions and service, fulfilling the needs of the Greek middle and upper class.

The full membership in the EU and the Euro zone, attracted new economic activities and events in the capital. The new arc west-east, vertical to the until-then north-south axis of development, sets the production of a new economic geography of the city.

A domino of actions and projects consign the common and public goods to the private interest. There are directions towards business zones, entertainment-touristic hubs, commercial cores etc, combined with new infrastructure projects making Athens a new “second-degree global city”. The Olympic Games in 2004 cost 4 times more than the expected. Most of the constructed venues, out of scale for the city's needs, spread all over Attica without any specified planning. Metro, tram, Attica Highway, the unification of archeological sites, and some pedestrianisation of main streets seemed to satisfy the needs of the city. (Although some regeneration processes displaced traditional -mainly commercial- uses)

As a result we can say that there was a clear vision for the city of Athens directly connected with the role of Athens in the European Union sphere on one hand and on the global level as well: The vision is described by the incorporation of the city as a peripheral pole for the Mediterranean and the Balkan region and by making Athens a pole of attraction of interest so as to reinforce its position in the global market.
Fear and Loaming in Athens
Public and collective land formed a pole of economic interest. In the beginning the regulative plan continues to set the gravity point on the expansion of the city to the whole prefecture of Attica. New centralities are proposed and start to develop along the axis of Attica highway, showing the clear tendency to attract economic investments to the city.

Businesses, relocation of some public sector services from the centre to the north, shopping malls attracting the commercial use outside of the city and new residential poles form the new centralities. In a metropolitan level Athens is still considered as an enterprising bond of the EU with Middle East and Asia. However, the lack of economic flow and the unfavorable conditions block most of the projects and plans that aim to reinforce the status of Athens/Attica in the system of the European Union and it’s role among the global metropolitan cities. As a result, the processes seem to cease temporarily in expectation of new economic sources.

The second tendency that appeared the last years seems to focus on the city centre; seeing the heart of the city as a field for development. There is a shift from the interest in regional projects to the city centre (plans for infrastructure, architectural and urban competitions/projects/plans). New movements and initiatives (apart from the demonstrations) expressed in the physical space try to find solutions and space for the real needs of the society.

The official plans for the city however, fail to see the reality (extreme rise in the migrant population in the city, closed shops, abandoned buildings, drug trafficking and use, demonstrations, prostitution, etc) that form the city centre currently (as shaped through years) and consider the existing situation only as a problem. The tendencies and visions for the city embrace the “global city” model but not the globalization process that has its effects (negative or not) on Athens.
Shifting perspectives of space

State structure
Image 6: Administrational organisation from Greece to Athens
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Image 7: Demographics from the scale of Greece to Athens

**Greece**
- autonomous monastic community
- 13 administrative regions
  - of which the Administrative region of Attica

**Administrative region of Attica**
- 8 regional units
  - of which Central Athens

**Central Athens**
- 8 municipalities
  - of which the Municipality of Athens

**Municipality of the center of Athens**
- 7 municipal districts

---

**Greece**
- 1.29% of the European land
- 1.51% of the European population

**Attika**
- 3.12% of National Land
- 35.33% of the National population

**Perfecture of Central Athens**
- 21.19% of Attika’s land
- 26.7% of Attika’s population

**Municipality of Athens**
- 21.19% of Central Athens land
- 64.39% of Central Athens population

**Munipalsty of the center of Athens**
- 64.39% of Attika’s population

---

**Greece**
- 10.787.690
- 131.957 km²

**Attika**
- 3.812.330
- 412 km²

**Perfecture of Central Athens**
- 1.018.440
- 87.3 km²

**Municipality of Athens**
- 655.780
- 3.55 km²
Power relations/ Σχέσεις εξουσίας

The following chapter presents the power relations and interrelations between stakeholders with access to decision making concerning the urban space of Athens. The analysis focuses on the power and economic interrelations between the related parties and aims to illustrate their variability and complexity. Actors with explicit influence on the formation of urban space are underlined along with formal and informal actors who have right to the city. Additionally, it annotates the external actors who influence or even determine decision making.

The second part of analysis presents the administrational organisation of the Greek state based on descending scales starting from the national level till the municipality of the centre of Athens.

In this map the relations, influences and dependencies are shown between the different actors of the Greek state and outside actors.

It is made visible that the IMF, EU and ECB loans have an influence on the state administration, its legislative power and executive power. EU financial instruments have an influence on the different scales of the organization; the peripheral entities, the municipality or a ministry.

The inhabitants have influence on the decision-making by voting. In this way the state is driven by its voters, but also by the fact that inhabitants of a country pay taxes for the organization of the state, for the common expenses. The counter influence of the so called ‘troika’, is opposing these voters and their point of view and demands. This becomes clear in the physical space where voters demonstrate in front of the parliament building.
Shifting perspectives of space

GLOBAL INFLUENCE

Troika∗
Banks
Euro-Zone members
European Commission
Media
NGO∗
International Organizations

DECISION MAKERS

Ministry of Economy
Ministry of Interior
Ministry of Development, Competitiveness, Infrastructure, Transport and Networks
Ministry of Environment, Energy & Climate Change
Ministry of Education Religious Affairs & Culture
Ministry of Administrative Reform and E-Governance
Independent authorities
Greek Orthodox Church

RIGHT TO THE CITY

Citizens
Inhabitants
Landowners
Neighborhood initiatives
Unions & associations

STAKEHOLDERS

Greek State
Municipalities
Greek Orthodox Church
Public Organizations
Public Companies
Private Companies
Public-Private Partnerships

CRA∗

Image 8: Power-relations Greece

Troika: European Commission, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the European Central Bank
NGO: Non-Governmental Organizations
CRA: Credit Rating Agency
ERDF: European Regional Development Fund
ESF: European Social Fund
EAGF: European Agricultural Guarantee Fund

* Image 8: Power-relations Greece
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Fear and Loaning in Athens
δ Urban analysis
In this part we introduce the urban analysis by exploring key concepts, themes and perspectives that interested us and that were produce from our research for the city of Athens. A set of urban maps will be employed to guide us through a series of interactions and comprehensions of the city that will help us reach to the underlying structures that shape social interactions. The city through the urban analysis will be the context through which we will be able to test the concepts, theories and findings presented in the research about the city of Athens. The urban analysis is conducted in two parts, the regional scale and urban scale. The issues, the key concepts and the themes are explored first in the regional scale and then, zooming-in, in the urban scale. The analysis of the city in the urban scale involves also social issues that we came across during our research of the city, and we are interested in exploring their spatial representations. The urban analysis will be the base on which our collective, as well as of our individual projects, strategy will be formed.
Introduction/ Εισαγωγή
Regional scale/ Περιφερειακή κλίμακα
Shifting perspectives of space

This map shows the vision and the tendencies for Athens as a global city. The city is being connected through axis and networks that spread in three directions: to the west, to the Mediterranean zone and to the north European countries.

ATHENS PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL ROLE

SOURCE:
Organisation of Regulatory Plans and Protection of the Environment
Proposal of Regulatory Plan for Attica 2009
Athens is one of the most dense cities in Europe. This map shows the residential density (inh/km²) in the region of Attica in 2001.

DENSITIES

Athens is one of the most dense cities in Europe. This map shows the residential density (inh/km²) in the region of Attica in 2001.

SOURCE:
www.organismosathinas.gr
Shifting perspectives of space

This map shows the green qualities in the metropolitan area of Athens and the protected forestal land. Concerning urban green, it can be said that its structure seems scattered, mainly concentrated on the north and eastern part of the metropolitan area. Concerning the forests-Natura 2000 areas, these hilly areas in combination with the water used to be the natural boundaries of Athens. However, after the 1990's and the natural environment of Attika, is been threaten and constrained by the every-summer fires and the simultaneous sprawl.

Generally, Athens metropolitan area has one of the lowest percentages in green spaces in Europe, four time less the the EU standard - 10m2 per inhabitant.

SOURCE:
This map shows the development of the city from the beginning of the 20th century until now. The city was intensively extended due to the suburbanization process during '70s-'80s. By the construction of a new motor-way (B) in 2000, the city has started to sprawl in the Eastern part of Attica, in the area called Mesogeia.

SOURCE:
www.ametro.gr
This map shows the network of public transport in the metropolitan area of Athens.

**Infrastructure Hub**

**Network Length**
- Metro (isap): 25.5 km
- Metro (attiko metro): 23.6 km
- Bus: 6,900 km
- Tram: 26 km

**Average Users per Day**
- Metro (isap): 400,000
- Metro (attiko metro): 650,000
- Bus: 1,300,000
- Tram: 25,000

**Source:**
www.ametro.gr
INCOME LEVELS

This map shows the distribution of income of the residents of the metropolitan area of Athens along the south to north axis.

Reading this map, we have to take into consideration that the high and low income is defined according to the economical standards of Greece, where the minimum wage is one of the lower in Europe and the second lower between the countries of the Eurozone.

SOURCE:
SOCIO-ECONOMIC CLASSES

Through the historical analysis of the city of Athens, we mapped its urban sprawl. But the way the city has expanded is deeply connected with the movement of social classes to different parts of the city according to their needs. In this map we see the current formation of the socio-economic classes in the city of Athens and how this can be connected with important projects for the city.
NEW CENTRALITIES

This map shows the main centralities in the region of Attica, as well as the new centralities in the periphery of the city. The new cores of attraction which are supported by the new infrastructure have reformed the structure of the city.

SOURCE:
www.organismosathinas.gr
The new centralities in the periphery of the city, easily accessible by the infrastructure network, absorb activities from the city centre. This map shows the distribution of functions in the central cores of Attica, as well as the new poles of attraction.
Shifting perspectives of space
OFFICIAL BOUNDARIES

This map shows the subdivision of the Municipality of Athens into districts and neighborhoods in 1991.

SOURCE:
http://www.demography-lab.prd.uth.gr
URBAN TISSUE

The built environment in relation to the streets shows the density of the city and the way in which the building blocks are spread over the city. The zoom in shows that there are open spaces that can't be perceived on the city scale, but that spread all over the city. These are the courtyards inside the building blocks, which are often not connected to the public space of the street.
GREEN AND OPEN SPACE

The built environment has little public spaces like parks and squares. On a smaller scale a street network with trees and arcades can be found that provide shadow and greenery. In the case of squares the sides of the public space that are connected to the buildings, are most in use. This map shows the disconnection between different large green spaces and the pressure on the street as a public space due to the car use.

SOURCE:
This map shows the network of public transport in the municipality of Athens.
ROAD NETWORK

This map shows the main road network and the transportation hubs in the centre.

SOURCE:
Evolving characters and policies in the city centre of Athens and Piraeus, Research program, Phase A, NTUA, Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate change, 2011
Shifting perspectives of space

This map shows the centralities of different functions in the center of Athens and the network they create. In this map is represented a diagram of the most important knots of public space in the center of Athens. These are green spaces, landmarks or functional spaces, and could be understood as basic spaces that create links between different areas of the city. They create a network of possible movements or functional links, important characteristics of the centrality of Athens. The differentiation of colour and radius shows the different function and importance of each knot, while the network that is created by their connections is also separated in primary and secondary links.

source:

CENTRALITIES

area of interest

transportation hubs
commercial centers

level of importance

0m 250m 500m 1000m

primary connections

secondary connections

leisure areas
green spaces
archaeological spaces

centrality

N
HEIGHTS

This map shows the number of stories of the buildings in the city centre of Athens. The highest building density is around Omonia square and in the area of Kypseli.

The dominant typology of the urban tissue is the polykatoikia that often has a 1,5 story ground floor for other functions than dwelling, like shops, cafés, etc.

SOURCE:
DENSITY

The northern part of the sample has a very high density.

SOURCE:

Density compared to other European cities (m inh/km sq)

- Stockholm: 4.2
- Rome: 1.6
- Paris: 20.0
- Madrid: 4.8
- Vienna: 1.8
- London: 5.1
- Lisbon: 3.9
- Copenhagen: 5.8
- Helsinki: 3.2
- Prague: 2.3
- Brussels: 4.1
- Berlin: 4.8
- Athens: 18.8
- Amsterdam: 4.5
LAND USE

The land uses in the municipality of Athens are mainly mixed. We identify centralities forming a quite dense pattern. We notice that apart from the historical part and the green-open parks-hills of the city, there is a distinction in uses between the west and the east part of the city. The West of the city is focused on industrial uses while the East engages facilities related to services and commodities (sports, health, culture etc.).

SOURCE:
Map: Organisation of Regulatory Plans and Protection of the Environment
General Urban Plan: Municipality of Athens 2010

SOURCE:
LAND PRICES

This map represents the strict land values in the center of Athens. It is clear that there is a variety of land prices, from the higher to the lower. The areas around Acropolis, the Parliament and the Lykabitos Hill have the highest land value, while the area with low land values are historically considered as industrial or working class areas.

From 2008 and on, and mainly due to the economic recession, there is a clear tendency for the land values of the center to fall. Despite the general fall of the prices, the areas with high land value are still considerably high, especially in comparison with the other areas.

SOURCE:
This map shows the distribution of income of residents in different areas of the center of Athens. The current levels of income, especially in the center of Athens, have been influenced by the high rates of unemployment in Greece. This has played an important role to the living conditions of Greek families (according to Eurostat in 2011 22.4% of the people in Greece live in jobless households) and to the way low income households are distributed in the center of Athens.

SOURCE:
onsite research

INCOME LEVELS II

This map shows the distribution of income of residents in different areas of the center of Athens. The current levels of income, especially in the center of Athens, have been influenced by the high rates of unemployment in Greece. This has played an important role to the living conditions of Greek families (according to Eurostat in 2011 22.4% of the people in Greece live in jobless households) and to the way low income households are distributed in the center of Athens.
This map shows the concentration of abandoned buildings in the centre of the city. The functional decay is identified in the main arteries as well as in central residential areas. Several reasons are related with the functional decay such as the suburbanization process, the new centralities in the periphery and recent economic crisis.

SOURCE:
Fear and Loaning in Athens

This map shows the concentration of abandoned buildings in the centre of Athens and their former use.

ABANDONMENT II

SOURCE:
This map shows the concentration of homeless in relation with spaces where common meals are organized. The definition of homeless can be separated in 4 different categories: people who live in the streets, people without houses that live in shelters, people who squat and people that live in unfitted places like containers and slums. The homeless in the center of Athens are increasing constantly and even though until now it looked like the ‘greek city’ could respond to the demands of housing (usually not by social housing but through policies like granting and legalization of encroachment), the situation now has changed mostly due to the increasing number of people that are under the danger of poverty.

SOURCE:

onsite research

HOMELESS CONCENTRATION

Source: ELSTAT
According to the Greek penal code, the use of drugs and drug possession (certain grams) are no longer a crime. However, drug trafficking is considered as a felony, punishable by imprisonment and a fine aggregate. Drug trafficking and drug use in public space, are activities concentrated mainly around areas of the center, with high density and an important percentage of old and/or abandoned buildings. Concerning the land use, these areas are either commercial (around Omonoia), or low-income mixed-residential (Metaxourgio). According to representatives of KETHEA, some of the points of concentration are coincided to be “needle-areas” since the last decade (Omonoia sq.) and some others are emerged the last years or months, according to tendencies concerning drug policies, police missions, socio-ethnical characteristics of dealers and addicted users.

Analyzing the statistics, it can be said that from 2006 the number of addicted users is fluctuates around 20.000 p. However their presence in public space (during daytime as well) has been intensified because of the increase of unemployment, poverty and homeless people.

Problem drug use

Estimations about drug addicted people - General population general tendencies: Add. more addicted users/year
IMMIGRATION

This map shows the differences between groups of immigrants and their presence in relation to the total population. The Albanian immigrants that reside in the north part of our sample are living there for 20 years now. Conflicts are taking place between Greeks and recent immigrants from Afghanistan and North Africa.

**SOURCES:**

- Group 1: Romanian – Russian – Kazakh – Polish – Armenian
- Group 2: Albanian
- Group 3: Bulgarian – Georgian – Moldavian – Ukrainian
- Group 4: Sri Lankan – Filipino – Ethiopian
- Group 5: Bangladeshi – Indian – Pakistani – Iraqi (95% men)
According to the Greek law, prostitution is legal and regulated (certain permission). Male prostitution and procurment are illegal. According to a researcher of Panteio University and National Center Social Research, the 1st semester of 2012, prostitution activities has increased by 1500%.

Prostitution activities are mainly concentrated on the western part of the center (Patission boundary). They are developed radially around Metaxourgio and Filis, along with main axes and spreaded in minor streets around.

**SOURCE:**
- www.bourdela.com
The city has always been an area and space of conflict. To conceptualize groups, people and maybe space as visible and invisible, as feared and not, as wanted and undesirable is a common practice in the city of Athens and is what creates the relations of action and reaction. We are surely mistaken if we believe that a city with so many different characteristics can be free of inner contradictions.

The dipole of action and reaction relations can be separated in two categories:

1. society versus institutions and
2. actions and reactions within the society.

In the first category we map actions like demonstrations, manifestations, squatting of public space and buildings and areas of conflict with the police as actions and reactions to legislation and the political system. In the second category, we mostly notice actions and reactions that happen within the society itself like between different ethnicities of immigrants, or between other society groups.

In this map, we spatialize these actions and reactions and map the areas of conflict.
TOLERANCE

The city in general, and Athens in particular, is an area of conflict and invisible boundaries. Especially, the city center concentrates most of the friction between the new (immigrants, homeless, drug-addicts and other minorities) and the old inhabitants. Although, there are still areas of the center where co-existence is succeeded between the old and the new inhabitants. With this map, we spatialize the elements that we consider play an important role in order to create tolerance between different groups.

Voters of extreme right in %, 2010

SOURCE
POLICE SURVEILLANCE

This map shows police presence according to police stations, areas of constant police controls and cameras. In this map we identify police presence as a instrument of control. Besides the different police stations, there are areas where there is constant police presence like the area around the university (Exarchia) and the area around the square of Omonia (high concentration of immigrants). The last years, there have been many reports for police violence during demonstrations as well as towards immigrants and other minorities. Due to the extension of these incidents, as well as their increasing number, Amnesty International has conducted an investigation on police violence in Greece and has written a report referring to several incidents and asking the Greek government to take measures in order to eliminate them.

SOURCE:
onsite research
Shifting perspectives of space

Image 9: map indicating locations of sections and the sample square in the centre of Athens
Fear and Loaning in Athens
The public space in Athens is very contested. The balconies are the outside space for the inhabitants and used for plants, laundry, chairs, airco's, etc. The ground floor is used by shops or cafés due to the form of the polykatoikia with its 1,5 level ground floor. The space underneath arcades is used by these shops, restaurants and other functions. They take the space in with chairs, tables, plants, carpet and light bulbs.

The sidewalk is in use for parking, for kiosks, for the placement of containers and sometimes for walking.

The largest part of the space between the houses is in use by the car and by parked cars and scooters. This is a more exclusive use; no other uses take place on the road.

The trees provide shading and make a buffer between traffic and public spaces that are used to stay.
Conclusions
Statements/ Επισήμανσεις
Invisible Boundaries - Spatial Integration/Social Segregation

Redefinition of Public Realm/Gap between public & private

Top-down decisions not responding to reality

New actors/inhabitants not included in the decision making/Bad implementation

New ways of uses ‘Formal & Informal’ uses

Shifting role of the centre/Uneven development between centre-periphery
Some words for the Common Vision-Approach

The shifting role of the Center of Athens

Since the 1990’s, the center of Athens face several transformations concerning more its socio-economic structure and less its morphology. As it has been above analyzed, Athens urban environment, constitute a multi-layered assemblage. According to Zenghelis (2011), at first sight the urban form of Athens could be described as informal, spontaneous, unplanned. In fact, the city of Athens is the result of very specific but unspoken political projects. However, it can be said that center’s current structure and image, marked by the socio-political and demographic shifts of 1922, has been defined by the period of sharp post-war urbanization. More precisely, the rapid urbanization of the capital and the increased urban demands in combination with the lack of welfare urban policies led to certain modes of production of space, (property laws and legal frameworks concerning the production of housing i.e. antiparochi, subsequent legalizations of arbitrary constructions and self-housing), determined urban qualities, cultures, tactics and at the same time a socially-mixed structure. A mixed-use compact and dense modern city-center with vertical social differentiation was formed, a fact that led to a certain class cohabitation.

This condition of cohabitation started altering from the 1980’s and mainly the 1990’s with the massive suburbanization of Athens, since some inhabitants of the centre, having the financial means, moved on the outskirts of the city purchasing a better quality of everyday life and a different lifestyle. In 1990’s, under the influence of the economic development of the country, the European perspective and the expansion of the financial domain and loaning reinforced this tendency. The suburbanization of the capital during 1990’s, coincide with the abolishment of the socialist regimes in Europe and the inflow of immigrants. Therefore, immigrants arriving in the city, started filling the gap which previous inhabitants of the center left. More specifically, they started installing in the most dense central neighborhoods, areas with low urban quality and lower rents.

The suburbanization of the 1980’s and 1990’s in combination with the decentralization triggered by the Olympics Project and the sprawl of the city intensified after 2004, shifted the gravity points of the city, since new residential areas and centralities have been emerged. This uneven development between center and periphery is a tendency obvious even from the rise of 21st century, since the population of the Municipality of the Center had increased per 3% and the population Attica region had an increase of 39% in total (POLYZOS, G., VATAVALI F., 2009.). More precisely, although Athens center, being part of the collective memory of the inhabitants and still part of their everyday life, started gradually losing its importance. The Olympic infrastructure and the post-Olympic urban development, characterized by the decentralization of public services traditionally located in the center and the creation of big commercial and entertainment hubs supported by heavy infrastructure, absorbed more interest from the center led to urban sprawl and to the indifference/deteriorization and “abandonment” of the centre and gave room for the informal to emerge. In fact, the centre of Athens, as being a place of non-interest “economic and political”, area with low rents, area was one of the places that could host the new waves of immigrants, refugees, low income and poor. This condition in combination with the lack of integration policies/immigration policies/policies for vulnerable social groups,
converted areas of the center places for the undesirables. Therefore, inhabitants of the center - elderly people who denied leaving their property and moving on the outskirts, young people seeking for affordable housing, immigrants searching for accessibility to housing and to temporal informal jobs- having low quality urban services, facing the lack of policies/actions for the everyday life in the center of Athens, formed an explosive mixture and started conflicting to each other.

The above mentioned conditions in the center of Athens, have not occurred from the one day to the other or are not a direct result of the economic crisis of 2009. In fact, we are talking about a process forged already from the 1990's emerged in early 2000's and rocketed after 2004, when the economic recession of the country started. However, it is mainly after 2009 and the austerity measures, the economic and social suppression, when the fear of otherness, the insecurity and the aggression increase dramatically and the social sustainability of the center collapse.

Nowadays, the public discourse about the future of center of Athens has been intensified and the “return of the inhabitants in the center of Athens” has became the main core of this discussion. Fact that approves the gradually rising interest for the central areas. However, it is worth questioning to which groups the center will address in the future? Which groups are taken into account? The dialectic of “return” is already a position, a statement that we try to question through our common approach for the center of Athens.

common vision- approach_container city

The container city is a place where everyone, regardless of their economic means, gender, race, ethnicity or religion, is enabled and empowered to fully participate equally in the social, economic and political processes taking place in the city. Having as a starting point the concept of the right to the city developed by the French philosopher and sociologist Henri Lefebvre, the container city is perceived as collective project in which all the inhabitants and the users of a city can reshape its future, by inhabiting actively, by participating in public life.

The container city, is an inclusive model-strategy which takes into account all, “good” and “bad” facets of urbanity, an focus on otherness and the right to be different. The example of Athens center shows that diversity does not linearly produce tolerance. Therefore, out of the romanticism of harmonic utopias, container city is a socially mixed environment, where the urban space can encompass the imaginary, the private, the public and the common/participatory spaces for all the inhabitants. However, the concept of container is more a strategy on its self and less a model, since it tries to define multiple ways to achieve tolerance, solidarity and affiliation with space. Under this perspective the main cores of the container are the following concepts:

i. accessibility: equal accessibility to urban space, to services, to economic activities and cultural projects
ii. participation: the right to decide and shape the future image of the city and the everyday life within
iii. affiliation: attachment with urban space and people and development of the sense of belonging, being part of an urban system. Container city is not taking for granted existing hierarchical structures and prejudices of societies. On contrary, the inhabitants by equal participation can transform in time the physical and immaterial space of the city, through negotiation action and interaction.

Athens: towards a container city

The abandoned city, economic and, in the United States, racial, is the place for the very poor, the excluded, the never employed and permanently under employed, the homeless and the shelter residents. A crumbling infrastructure, deteriorating housing, the domination of outside impersonal forces, direct street-level exploitation, racial and ethnic discrimination and segregation, and the stereotyping of women are everyday reality.2

The historical and urban analysis for Athens, in regional and city scale, led to the above mentioned statement of the shifting role of the Center of Athens. During the entire analysis, we observed that during the modern and contemporary urban history of Athens, top-down decisions, mainly focused on networks/big infrastructure/new centralities, were unable to respond to the reality and to the everyday life on the inhabitants of the center. More precisely, important issues concerning urban quality, urban economy, social integration were ignored and an emphasis was given to the periphery. In 21st century Athens entered to the game of competitiveness between cities, purchasing investments and developing Global City model. However, aspects of globalization such as immigration, global economic crisis, were not taken into account.

It could be said that this blind-eyes approach led to a highly complex socio-spatial condition in the central

neighborhoods. *New actors*, such as immigrants, refugees, homeless, became gradually part of the center and since they were and still are the subjects of discrimination and social exclusion, developed a parallel “informal” reality which nowadays conflicts the “formal”, “official” and widely “accepted” reality of the inhabitants of the center. As it has been analyzed above, the center of Athens is in transitional phase since the 1990’s, therefore the “problems” dialectic about the future of the center is a condition existing even before the economic crisis. The only difference is that the current economic crisis and the austerity policies have as result the *shrinkage of the public*, the loss of social and civil rights, the loss of accessibility to public services and spaces, the suppression of middle income classes, the further marginalization of vulnerable classes, the “undesirables” and subsequently the rise of fear of the other, the increase of insecurity and depression the emerge of extreme right ideologies and practices.

We believe that an blind-eyes approach towards vulnerable groups lead to an extensive social polarization and clash and threatens the “social sustainability”. With our approach we intent to identify and take into account all the actors/inhabitants of the centre, since we believe that this dynamic configuration within the context of “the container city”, analyzed above, can lead to the revitalization of the center, to the redefinition of the center and can be a way to highlight alternatives concerning coexistence within the context of crisis. Our approach aims to provide in different levels of decision making - recommendation for national policies/legal framework, in municipal level, and actions local level- and we aim mainly in activating bottom-up initiatives. Since we perceived urban space as an amalgam of geographical characteristics, historical, social and political-economy processes, thus the proposed actions aim to tackle the issues of Athens through all these topics. Finally, our approach works with the existing context, which means that we take into account, transform and reinterpret the existing urban form, the existing social structure and processes always taking into consideration the transformations and the consequences of economic crisis. We try with an acupunctural interventions/ with alternative financial means/ we propose ways for achieving an inclusive-container city model.
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ACTION PLAN

CONCLUSIVE STATEMENTS

Invisible Boundaries
Spatial Integration
Social Segregations

Redefinition of Public Realm / Gap between public & private

Top-down decisions not responding to reality

- national perspective & planning
  - participation in decision making
  - low cost proposals

- economy
  - policy for parallel education/exchange knowledge

- education
  - enhance the existing solidarity network in favor of social security
  - re-use of existing buildings for housing homeless

- migration
  - question the density & open space
  - restrictions to the car use in the city center

- social margins

- media

- culture & beliefs

- urban regulation

- urbanisation processes

Image 11: Action plan for the continuation of 5 individual perspectives
New actors/inhabitants not included in the decision making/ Bad implementation

- New way of uses “Formal” & “Informal” uses
- Shifting Role of the center Uneven development between centre-periphery

- legal framework to allow new uses
- enhance exchange economy self-producing re-use
- reinforce local economies

- provide citizenship to immigrants children & under certain conditions to immigrants
- reinforce health facilities & accessibility
- use technology to provide information on local stories

- expand & enhance the adult schools for immigrants

- policies for a. abandoned buildings b. listed buildings c. in between spaces
dev. public transport-oriented projects
This research is continued into individual research and design projects. These individual projects will find 5 different strategies to approach the city: 5 perspectives.

1 city: Athens
1 common approach: Container
5 perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective 1</th>
<th>Perspective 2</th>
<th>Perspective 3</th>
<th>Perspective 4</th>
<th>Perspective 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marloes van der Pols</td>
<td>Katerina Salonikidi</td>
<td>Evgenia Zioga</td>
<td>Maria Stamati</td>
<td>Ifyenia Dimitrakou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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City: Athens
Common approach: Container City
Perspectives

Perspective 1
Marloes van der Pols

Perspective 2
Katerina Salonikidi

Perspective 3
Evgenia Zioga

Perspective 4
Maria Stamati

Perspective 5
Ifiyenia Dimitrakou

Transition/ Μετάβαση
Fear and Loaning in Athens
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