

Ravello Lab 2011

Panel 2

“Culture and territory: processes of local development ‘cultural driven’”

Background paper

INTRODUCTION:

In the international literature concerning the management of cultural heritage, networks have assumed since a long time an important role.

Networks are indeed a model of management already well tested since the mid-nineties. Their relevance is today a spread interpretative formula that has increased because of changes in economic and social fields caused by technological innovations, market and knowledge globalization and by productive dynamics in all the economic sectors.

These changes have become crucial not only for the comprehension of the switch from a fordist economic model of economy to a post-materialistic one, but also for the individuation of the operative instruments useful to increase the value of the produced and consumed culture.

In particular, in the sector of cultural heritage and activities management, the empiric observation shows why the complementarity of resources, a more favourable faculty of the access to financing and the activation of economies of scale are the principal motivations at the basis of the creation of networks among cultural enterprises.

Thus, the model of network is an answer for several issues, such as:

- a) Increasing the effectiveness (thanks to economies of scale) and the efficacy (enriching the variety of offered services) of cultural production.
- b) Developing the impacts of the productive chain and permitting the birth and the strengthening of new enterprises.
- c) Increasing the skills of self-financing of the sector, even with donations and sponsorship.
- d) Increasing the capability of attraction of the territory thanks to a development of its overall quality and its social resources.

Networks cause then direct impacts on each subject of the system, helping in reaching the targets of improvement of the operative capability, creation of added value and of legitimization and support towards their environment of reference.

NETWORKS AND AREAS OF COOPERATION IN CULTURAL HERITAGE AND ACTIVITIES MANAGEMENT: THE DISTRICT HYPOTHESIS

Cultural districts are a sort of network that includes, in the frame of the cooperation among cultural organizations, all the components of the supply, as historical, artistic and archaeological heritage, but also involving performing arts and the so called “cultural industries” (such as publishing, music industry, and movie industry).

In this context, the cultural structure connects itself, on a huge scale, with the perspective of local developing, and cultural district aims at enclosing into its mechanisms all that economic possibilities that can increase the enhancement of cultural resources and the promotion of the territory.

The model of cultural district is not actually codified, and it has assumed several different “shapes” and ways of functioning: in Anglo-Saxon context, for example it has given answers to the open questions on industrial restructuring of many areas suffering of post-industrial crisis, especially for the urban ones, making these zones active in the field of creativity and able to assure a continuous and dynamic cultural production.

One of the most relevant difference between the concept of “district” and the concept of “network” is the existence in the first model of an *industrial atmosphere*, which is an important instrument for spreading knowledge, a fundamental mechanism of coordination of the economic players and a necessary condition to build up a specular relation and reciprocal support between values and culture of the territory in which a district is born and develops.

It is therefore evident that the necessity of focusing on the conditions of transferring the district model is strongly noticeable, in the field of cultural heritage and activities management. This issue could be inquired through an appropriate redefinition of the district structure and the logic that lies on it.

It is clear then that social and cultural conditions that are behind the development of a district are not the natural consequence of direct actions of policy. As a result, the possibility of investigating cultural districts as a specific is linked instead to one of these hypothesis:

- a) The realization of cultural district is possible only in a territory in which there is already a sort of district structure in other industrial sectors. This hypothesis is already well known into the international praxis and shows its strength in the actual scenario in which the innovative capability of the enterprises is fundamental.

From this point of view, an investment (from a public or private source) in the sector of culture aims at obtaining a closer connection between culture and social and economic life of the territory. Thus, cultural heritage gives tools, processes, contents, and values to the other players of the productive system, helping the cultural district in its development.

b) In a less strict definition, the cultural district does not arise from a spontaneous input, but comes from a specific policy. In this case the district cannot run with automatic processes that are already in its nature. In this hypothesis the pre-existence of a classical district structure is not a fundamental condition for the creation of a cultural district.

The projects built up in the last years by local public administrations (such as Regions and Municipalities) and private subjects (e.g. bank foundations), promoting the development of the territory thanks to local cultural heritage and institutions seem to belong at this second statement.

These projects have been characterized by a different range of aims (that is because of the contribution of different players, of public and private nature), and have activated collaborative behaviours and antagonistic co-operation among the players. As a result the level of efficiency and effectiveness of governance increased, and created a specific debate among the players of the project about the analysis, the planning and the negotiation of this model.

ISSUES OF DEBATING

This round table wants to inquire the problem of territorial cooperation referring to:

- Cooperation network among enterprises operating into the field of cultural heritage and cultural activities.
- Cooperation network between cultural enterprises and other kind of enterprises, organizations and institutions of the territory.

In a more specific way, the debate of the morning aims at drafting a sort of a “reasoned balance” about some of the most relevant Italian experiences of cultural district, trying to focus on:

- Strengths and weaknesses of these experiences.
- Elements that can be usefully replicated

Starting from these issues, the afternoon session will explore ideas, suggestions and instruments useful in order to enhance this form of cooperation among enterprises, with a specific attention to the identification of operating models and to cultural driven local development.

Therefore the debate points to investigate:

- a) Advantages of territorial cooperation, especially in a lack of economic resources.
- b) Territorial features which bond or favour cultural driven local development.

- c) Necessities of changing public policies sustaining networks of local cooperation.
- d) Procedures and models of cooperation between public and private players for cultural organization and cultural networks management.
- e) Necessary and lacking competences and skills to realize networks for territorial cooperation.
- f) Legal ties and actions which help the creation of this kind of networks, with the perspective of local economic development.
- g) Faculties of the access to funding and the relative methods to dialogue with banking and investors.
- h) Critical issues, techniques and methods in the activities of monitoring, measuring and evaluating projects oriented to cultural driven local development.
- i) Effects of cultural driven networks on social development.
- j) Financial instruments to support the governance model.