

# Land use planning and the evaluation of the cultural built heritage

by

Annalisa Cicerchia

## Abstract

Over the past five decades, cultural heritage policies in Italy have failed to include systematic territory-based strategies. Today, despite a lively debate on decentralisation, territory is still seen in mere juridical and administrative terms, which amounts to being not perceived at all.

Instead, policies for valorisation and cost-effective management of the cultural heritage basically require an appropriate territorial dimension. Defining such a dimension is not an easy task, both on the institutional and on the conceptual and theoretical level. That definition is best approached from an integrated medium-long term planning vision of the strategic goals at stake in the territory governance. In this planning vision, strategic goals and means to achieve them are related in a logically-framed *program structure*.

Identification of the strategic goals of a new cultural heritage policy has three preconditions: first, a better co-ordination of the public subjects involved; second, a better trade-off between conflicting objective functions; third, the need for a *planning notion* of what is meant by “cultural good”.

## 1. The problem

Among the projects launched by the EC Raphael Program this year, a stimulating line of study focuses on the relationship among heritage conservation and valorisation, an appropriate use of territory and land-use planning<sup>1</sup>. That project starts with a twofold question:

- a) identification of the connections between the degradation/valorisation problem of the cultural heritage and goods *and* the land-use and environmental planning;
- b) study of which principles, parameters, organisation of the land use and environment might be suitable and indeed be a prerequisite for an active, balanced (degradation/valorisation) management of the cultural heritage and goods<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> See, in particular, the HECOPLAN Project (1998-1999), promoted by Archibugi (Italy), Greffe (France), Lichfield (U.K.) and Nijkamp (The Netherlands).

<sup>2</sup> See Archibugi (1998).

That is an innovative approach, especially when compared with the direct or indirect cultural heritage policy orientations in Italy<sup>3</sup>, characterised by a high degree of indifference for the territorial dimension.

In fact, over the past 50 years, cultural heritage<sup>4</sup> policies in Italy have failed to include systematic territory-based strategies. Despite a lively debate on decentralisation, territory is still seen in mere juridical and administrative terms, which amounts to being not perceived at all. Current approaches waver between very detailed and singular views of the individual “cultural good” and (though less frequently) macro, statistical, quantitative readings intrinsically insensitive to local and territorial peculiarities<sup>5</sup>.

Quite the reverse, policies for the valorisation and a cost-effective management of the cultural heritage basically require an appropriate territorial dimension. Defining such an appropriate dimension is not an easy task, both on the institutional and on the conceptual and theoretical level.

The Hecoplan Project suggests the following points as research guidelines:

- Which kind of relationship can be established between cultural heritage value and its territorial environment?
- Which kind of phenomena, variables or indicators, can express that relationship?
- What is the impact of land-use planning on cultural heritage conservation and valorisation policies?
- Do conservation and valorisation policies have different impacts on different categories of cultural goods?
- What are the defining and identifying characteristics - even *a priori* - of a *territorial unit of cultural heritage*?

### ***1.1 Value and territorial setting***

The first, complex question - the relationship between cultural heritage value and its territorial setting - not only involves taking into account the peculiar vari-

---

<sup>3</sup> To be true, a few “prophetic” ancestors could be found, but these unfortunately belong to the family of “voices crying in the wilderness”: as in the case of the QUADROTER Strategic Project by the National Research Council and the Ministry of the Environment, completed in 1992 and never implemented.

<sup>4</sup> In this paper, “Cultural heritage” only refers to what Lichfield defines “cultural built heritage”, and Throsby calls “Immovable Cultural Heritage”. Movable cultural goods have a different sort of relationship with their “territory”, far too complex to be discussed here.

<sup>5</sup> The sole noteworthy exception, in Italy, is the Ministry for Cultural Heritage Risk Map Project, where a quantitative approach to the cultural heritage merges with the perception of local differentiation in the matter of vulnerability of goods and the natural or man-made hazards, at a scale arriving to the municipal data disaggregation.

ables of any site where cultural immovable goods are located, but also identifying the *appropriate scale* which defines such value.

In fact, *the Scale shall vary* depending on:

- the *kind of value* one is dealing with<sup>6</sup>:
  - an historical building may have a different symbolic value at national and at local scale, or a stronger economic impact on the local rather than on the national scale, or an educational value on international scale which might be bigger than the local one, and so on. A highly-specialised historical archive may have a bigger use (or non-use) value on the international scale than on the national or local ones. On the other hand, the geo-political variable also weights on value determination: as Hutter (1997) notes, “the evaluation of the last and therefore marginal item is lower [in Italy] than in countries with few buildings and artefacts representing their cultural history and identity”;
- the *evaluating subject*<sup>7</sup>:
  - either individuals (non owners/users, owners/users, owners non users, non users, non owners) or groups (associations, foundations, communities, etc.); those subjects may reason in terms of utilities against cost; this, in turn, may be influenced by factors such as belonging to a majority or to a minority group; income; age; religion, etc.; the subject might also be the policy-makers, who are in no way a uniform and univocal group. Throsby classifies the potential stakeholders<sup>8</sup> of cultural heritage as follows:
    - a) those enjoying some direct private (excludable) benefit from the heritage item(s) under consideration;
    - b) those enjoying some beneficial externality or (non-excludable) public-good benefit from the item(s);
    - c) those bearing some direct cost associated with the heritage item(s), for example through contributing personally to the cost of upkeep, renovation, and so on;
    - d) those bearing part of the cost of upkeep, renovation and so on, when that cost is borne collectively, for example through tax expenditures;
    - e) those taking up or being encharged with the more general responsibility of making decisions on particular heritage items or cultural heritage matters (such as heritage policy);
- the *evaluating goal*.

---

<sup>6</sup> Here I must confine myself to recalling the vast literature on possible cultural heritage value dimensions: use/non use, economic/non economic, market/non market, tangible/intangible, existence, bequest, option, and so on.

<sup>7</sup> Literature is abundant in that field too. In this case, I follow the schemes suggested by Lichfield (1988) and Throsby (1997).

<sup>8</sup> A larger category than the simple beneficiaries. Note that analytic identification of the stakeholders is formally required in the process of strategic planning, introduced in 1993 for the US Federal Agencies by the Government Performance and Results Act.

Such goal could be, so to say, *internal* (protection, maintenance of the community identity, etc.) or *external* (employment, local development, etc.) to the heritage. In general, one of the main purposes for evaluation is to support public decisions about the “claims” of different heritage items competing for resources for their conservation, maintenance or enhancement<sup>9</sup>.

In some cases, the “cultural added value” increases the market value of an item, while in others (notably, when a building use is restricted by severe protective regulations) it may decrease its market value. Whether market indicators are available or not, a significant component of the cultural value of heritage buildings, sites and so on, will arise *outside the market*: that (as Throsby notes) is because an important proportion of stakeholders are not, and cannot be, parties to any market transaction. That is why one often resorts to methodologies like Contingent Valuation Methods, though they do not apply to future generations.

### ***1.2 Territorial indicators for the cultural heritage***

Measurement of the relationship between cultural heritage and its territorial setting requires the identification a series of phenomena or variables that could express that relationship as acceptable proxy. Those very measures are useful for the design of territorial policies able to impact on cultural heritage.

That calls for a targeted research, aimed at merging quality and quantity in an appropriate indicators system including:

- classification of the “cultural heritage endowment” of the territorial unit considered, as against the current and potential local and exogenous fruition demand;
- supply-demand relationship of the different cultural items current and potential uses (education, religious, tourism and trade, housing, institutional...);
- physical and economic accessibility of the cultural items (transportation, opening hours, safety, etc.);
- anthropic pressure on the different heritage items;
- buildings vulnerability related to various, natural and man-made, hazardous factors;
- locally-borne direct and indirect costs compared to locally-enjoyed direct and indirect utilities;
- centrally-borne direct and indirect costs compared to centrally-enjoyed direct and indirect utilities
- generation of intangible benefits: local, national, international;
- the relationship between subjects locally bearing direct and indirect costs and “central” subjects enjoying direct and indirect utilities;

---

<sup>9</sup> Throsby, *op. cit.* See also Causi (1992).

- the relationship between subjects centrally bearing direct and indirect costs and “local” subjects enjoying direct and indirect utilities.

Additional research should address the following questions:

- values that should act as reference or optimal standards;
- possible *benchmarking*: at which scale, for what phenomena;
- the appropriate application scale for the selected indicators.

### ***1.3 Territorial units of cultural heritage***

Which reference territorial units might be adequate for cultural heritage conservation and valorisation policies? Traditionally, one tends to resort to administrative territorial units. However, especially in a planning perspective, the existing administrative divisions are not always satisfactory.

Studies for developing alternative benchmarks are abounding, and the literature on the matter, after more than twenty years, is particularly rich<sup>10</sup>. Among others, Archibugi suggests the development of “planning areas”, conceived as the synthesis of functional spaces resulting from the application of social indicators, acting as reference for land-use planning. The reference area for an in-depth planning evaluation must in fact include those resource flows that one wants to create or modify<sup>11</sup>. Identification of the appropriate territorial settings where demand and supply of land-use can be balanced is therefore a basic requirement for a feasible, rational and sustainable planning.

A set of targeted studies on the subject<sup>12</sup> emphasises that the appropriate territorial setting – that is where most activities and pressure factors exert their impact (and where it is proper to assess and manage such impact through decisions, actions and interventions) – is the urban setting: “almost all human activities are linked to the citizen’s daily life, everyday life, and are functionally contained in a 12 hour span. They take place within the urban basin”<sup>13</sup>, which, however, is not the mere physical delimitation of the urban built area, but rather refers to the *functions* citizens carry out in the city, functions with a bigger scope than the built continuum. That scope is theoretically defined by the *acceptable daily commuting*, expressed by a given access isochrone (for instance, sixty minutes/day) to services.

---

<sup>10</sup> I will limit myself to recalling the Functional Economic Areas, on the basis of which Fox proposed in 1973 to redesign the United States statistical geography, and the Daily Urban System proposed by Doxiadis. FEAs are relatively self-contained labour markets, where residents can buy, within the area limits, an almost complete line of products and find a complete supply of local level public services. The Daily Urban System (Doxiadis, 1970), instead, defines the service and activities distribution (and consequently the urban function) on the basis of an access compatible with isochrones contained within the daily span of citizens' life.

<sup>11</sup> See Archibugi (1970).

<sup>12</sup> See the Quadroter Project (1992) and the EC DGXII Act-Vill Project (1994).

<sup>13</sup> See Archibugi (1992).

It is therefore the urban function system – or urban system – the appropriate space where the land use demand and supply are to be planned and controlled. It is necessary to evaluate to what extent and how the cultural heritage demand and supply operate within this functionally-defined concept of urban system.

#### ***1.4 A program structure for the cultural heritage***

A program is *par excellence* an instrument for creating and managing public policies, and is made of a set of *objectives*, systematically and hierarchically considered in their relation with a set of *means* apt to achieve them. This logically-framed vision is the *program structure*.

The adoption of a program structure generates a number of benefits, involving:

- a clear vision of the *mission* of the operating subject;
- identification and/or negotiation of the *general goals* the collectivity confers upon the operating subject;
- a clear vision of the logical links existing among general goals, programs and actions;
- a clear allocation of the available resources and means among different objectives;
- an *ex ante*, ongoing and *ex post* assessment of the goals attained at different levels of generality.

In 1993, Di Palma, Bianchini and Marchesi developed<sup>14</sup> a hypothetical program structure for a possible reform of the budget in the Italian Ministry of the Heritage. Such exercise was based upon the Ministry statute and current regulations. It identified four general goals for the Ministry activity:

- basic knowledge of the heritage;
- heritage protection and maintenance;
- increased access to and valorisation of the heritage;
- enhanced innovative research.

Those general goals were subdivided into specific first- and second-degree goals. Policies and actions, measured by goal and outcome indicators, were then attached to second-degree goals. Finally, the experiment proposed an *ad hoc* budget for the Ministry, functional to the suggested program structure.

Six years after this exercise, one has the impression that its methodological setting (as well as the proposed general goals) remains generally valid, and worth being reconsidered in operational terms.

Undoubtedly, the plan should be integrated with a careful consideration of interactions and trade-offs with all the institutional stakeholders of the heritage policies, including those (not responsible, for instance, of heritage protection, but of fighting unemployment) that deal with heritage inasmuch as employment reser-

---

<sup>14</sup> See Formez (1993).

voir or the institutions of the public finance mainly perceiving heritage as assets. Difficulties of such trade-offs are dealt with in detail in the next section.

## 2. Cultural goods as the object of a latent conflict among strategic goals

One of the key problems in public strategic planning is *co-ordination* among the subjects who are involved, for different reasons, in plan development and implementation, and who can affect its success. Unfortunately such co-ordination – not only in Italy – often appears as a *utopia*<sup>15</sup>.

Co-ordination failure generally means poor performance: policies are conceived and carried out in a fragmented way and they often contradict or neutralise each other. In the case of heritage policies in Italy, I think there is more than a simple lack of co-ordination: rather, fragmentation and inconsistency are the result of a *latent conflict among different missions or strategic goals*. A brief reference to the recent legislation and policies in Italy can help clarifying that point.

The basic Act in the matter of cultural heritage in Italy is a 1939 law, establishing “Heritage conservation and protection” as the peculiar State mission<sup>16</sup>. In the 80’s, the Ministry of Labour launched a campaign, called “Cultural mines” followed by similar initiatives, to fight unemployment through the creation of jobs in the field of heritage catalogation and (only partially) restoration. In those cases, a different mission was then operating: the mission was to create jobs and promote development in the backward areas of the Country. A similar approach has recently characterized the EC (see, for instance, Delors’ White Paper).

In the former case (the 1939 law), cultural goods and the heritage are the policy *object* and *final aim*. In the latter case, they become *means* of a policy aimed at fostering employment and economic development.

During the present decade, especially over the past few years, additional strategic goals are being projected on the heritage. These are tied to projects of public accounts readjustment, and see the heritage as a special type of asset, resource, patrimonial good, to be wisely used, especially in view of the problems tied to the EURO system to build. In that perspective, cultural heritage often appears in the most recent financial bills. Sometimes a (partial) sale to private buyers is proposed; sometimes the hypothesis is made to replace part of State transfers to Regions with the conferring of selected historical buildings from the State onto Municipal and Regional Authorities, and so on.

Additional diverse strategic goals inspire policies that somehow involve heritage on the various territorial levels of the Public Administration.

---

<sup>15</sup> A research project I am currently carrying out on the public cultural built heritage in the historical centre of Rome (ISPE-ICCD, *Valutazione e valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale pubblico*, 1996-2000) shows that five public agencies (belonging to either State or Municipality) have authority on this section of heritage. They do not share any substantial data each one of them possesses, nor is any of them aware of information owned by the others. Our project, for the first time, is creating an informative linkage.

<sup>16</sup> Since 1975, through a specific Ministry: before, through different National Authorities.

The different goals and aims that the various public agencies attribute to heritage affect:

- a) the heritage value dimensions. These will in fact emphasise, depending on their different *foci*, income generation, employment, education, community identification, absolute beauty and other aesthetic values, tradition, links to past and future generations, etc.;
- b) the decision criteria about maintenance or, conversely, a change in the use of the cultural built heritage;
- c) the definition of the appropriate (in planning terms) territorial dimension of heritage policies.

Conflict in strategic goals is bound to continue unless it is acknowledged and finally *managed*. That would imply identification of those institutional agents who are apt to handle the existing trade-offs in such a way to trigger positive synergies.

### 3. A “planning” concept of the cultural heritage

Over the past decades, the concept of cultural goods tends to broaden and to include many more components than in its original acception. Consider that in Italy, the first law on the subject (1909) strictly referred to “antiques and artistic things”. That deserves support on the intellectual and also cultural-political level, nonetheless, on the technical level; it creates rather than solves problems.

It is somehow possible – at least in some cases – to refer to a sound historical and critical academic tradition, as well as to an established arts or antiques market, that concern specific objects and exclude others, and clearly separates what experts (and buyers) do and do not<sup>17</sup> include in the term of “arts”. But the same task appears almost impossible if “cultural goods” are identified with “objects having the value of civilisation tokens”<sup>18</sup>, because even Neapolitan Espresso-Makers, transistor radios, old milk bottles, vinyl records, etc., might claim a value as “civilisation token”, that, honestly, no one could deny.

That is a misunderstanding, due to the fact that the Italian culture, still permeated with idealism, lacks the concept of *material culture* – typical of Anglo Cultural Anthropology. Material culture has nothing to do with Arts and History, but is rather based upon the documentation of the concrete technological, technical and formal solutions that peoples adopt during their existence.

Faced with the increasing gap between the richness of the heritage to protect and the decreasing public resources that cultural goods claim, one against the

---

<sup>17</sup> This perception is affected by fashion and marketing operations, subordinate to collective moods that can make rise and fall – in a whimsical way – ratings of authors, styles, periods. An interesting account of this process is proposed by Forte (1997).

<sup>18</sup> That expression was introduced in Italy in the mid-60’s by the Franceschini Commission, and lately definitely absorbed in the legislation.

other (and with other items in the expenditure list), we think it is possible to share the need for a definition bold and logically string enough to be *exclusive*.

Such definition of cultural goods would never claim any universal validity, but indeed would have a mere operational and planning meaning. It would be exclusive in the sense of “endowed with the capability to discriminate ” what is to be protected inasmuch as *excellent*, for its artistic or historical merits, or because it is particularly meaningful for the community and therefore “culturally selected” by the time razor. That is what deserves valorisation and optimal management. This is to be discriminated from what is not *excellent*, that is something that must be content with a non-priority place in the race for allocation of increasingly scarce resources.

What we are proposing, in other words, is to adopt a *planning concept of cultural good, to be only applied in a planning context*, supporting public decisions.

### ***3.1 A brief sketch of the state of the art***

Efforts to establish an objective benchmark to assess the heritage status and its content have been carried out by UNESCO<sup>19</sup>, as well as, recently, by ICOMOS<sup>20</sup>. However, as Throsby (1997) notes, even in the UNESCO Convention and in the Burra Charter, the definitions, though adopting among their basic criteria the “objective” requisite, for any object, of a minimal age to be entitled to the definition of cultural good, end up to be based upon experts' (subjective) judgements.

In relatively recent times, various efforts have been made in the direction of creating systems of multiple indicators that would permit to “appreciate” in less subjective and arbitrary terms the *cultural quality* of cultural goods. Particularly interesting are those proposed by Land (1973), Kalman (1980), Nijkamp (1995) and Massimo (1995).

All experiments aim at a ranking of the different cultural items, to be used as a support for public decision concerning investment, restoration projects, alternative uses, local development projects, etc.

They also have in common the adoption of a multi-criteria approach, where different strategic goals can obtain appropriate weights depending on the scope and purpose of the evaluation.

Criteria applied in those projects include:

- Architecture (style, representativeness; construction, age, architect, design, interior);
- History;
- Environment and setting;
- Usability (adaptability, accessibility, services, etc.);
- Integrity;
- Symbolic content;

---

<sup>19</sup> See UNESCO (1972).

<sup>20</sup> See ICOMOS (1992)

- Other social-economic factors.

A project of the kind is being carried out in Italy. It concerns the public-owned cultural built heritage located in the historical centre of Rome<sup>21</sup>. In the next session, a brief account is given of the evaluation model, which is being applied to the identification of the optimal building valorisation.

### 3.2 *The OIKIA model*

Aim of the study is the “evaluation and valorisation” of the public cultural built heritage: in particular, about 650 buildings<sup>22</sup> in the historical centre of Rome.

Among the criteria considered, a few chronological, typological and bibliographic criteria are especially tailored for Rome. In fact, 1527 marks the Sack of Rome, hence the beginning of a declining period. Typologies are evaluated also in comparison to their “uniqueness” and the peculiar social history; bibliographic and iconographic coverage refers to the classic sources available for Rome.

Evaluation is oriented along the lines of multicriteria analysis. It aims at highlighting the different building characteristics suggesting two alternate valorisation scenarios.

The **former scenario** is based upon the *intrinsic value* of the cultural good inasmuch as cultural good, to be preserved for the future enjoyment by the posterity, and to be offered to an improved direct vision by the contemporaries.

The **latter scenario** is characterised by an at least partially *instrumental* vision of the historical-artistic buildings, and the assessment of their capability to produce cost-effective services or income for the public owner.

Thus, three alternate uses are envisaged, the first deriving from the former scenario and the other two from the latter: “Maximisation of the complex cultural value”, “Maximisation of services” and “Maximisation of direct economic rentability”.

All the three orientations are programmatic and are based upon the following assumptions:

- Buildings will be used in an optimal manner, considering their characteristics;
- The proposed use is tendential, and especially for the second and third alternatives, does not exclude the possibility of a mix;
- Use will be cost-effective;
- Use will maximise the building productivity in terms of cultural value, social services or direct rentability.

---

<sup>21</sup> Progetto ISPE-ICCD, *Valutazione e valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale pubblico*, CNR, Progetto Finalizzato Beni Culturali, directed by Cicerchia.

<sup>22</sup> Active churches, monuments, fountains, bridges and other architectural items of single use are not included in the universe considered.

*The first alternative: Maximisation of the complex cultural value*

The main characteristic of that kind of valorisation is to be *entirely* based upon the distinctive characteristics of the buildings inasmuch as cultural goods of distinguished cultural, historical or artistic meaning.

Those buildings represent the excellent and emerging portion of the patrimonial set considered. They do not exceed the 7-8% of the whole.

Optimal uses of those buildings are, firstly, the direct visit on the part of the public, and, as a second best, the high institutional representation.

It is on those buildings that public resources for conservation should concentrate. They should however tend to a (partial) self-sufficiency, with an increased resort to forms of merchandising already in use in most museums.

*The second alternative: Service maximisation*

In this alternative, public historic buildings are used for producing services to the community. Services are intended in a broad sense: from administration to health services, education, support to social housing.

The buildings of that group are not particularly relevant from an historical and artistic point of view, they are easily accessed, and can be modified enough as to guarantee an effective operation.

Institutional use does not generate income for the public owner, but *savings*. Consider that, in 1998, the Rome Municipality paid over 24 billion liras per year in rents for public services: schools, administrative offices, etc.

Also “popular” houses, classified in the lowest categories in the land register, belong to that group: their main function being not rentability, but support to social housing.

In many cases, buildings were expressly built for the service they perform today (schools, ministries, parliament, etc.). In other cases, the original function has changed through time and now it is no longer compatible with the physical building characteristics (ancient hospitals; old schools, etc.). In the latter cases, a different use – always in the area of services – is advisable.

*The third alternative: Maximisation of direct economic rentability*

In this third alternative, public buildings are destined to income maximisation for their owner (the Municipality or the State).

Income is mainly generated in two ways:

- a) temporary concession, for cultural activities, association or representation;
- b) direct rentals (houses, offices or commercial uses)

Due to the complex Italian legislation, the hypothesis of sale is not considered.

To be eligible for this alternative, buildings should be structurally adequate to their possible functions, and should be located in prestigious areas. Decorations

are relevant only if their protection does not involve restrictions of use and adaptations.

Table 1 shows a summary description of the evaluation model that is being applied to the public buildings in Rome.

**Table 1. The OIKIA evaluation model**

Name				
	Criteria	val.1	val.2	val.3
1	Inclusion in the list of the State Historical Artistic Properties or Bond related to the 1939 Law 1089			
2	Continuity of use since the origin			
3	Consistency of use since the origin			
4	Homogeneity of the building with its urban historical setting			
5	Quality of the environment			
6	Age of building:			
	a) until 1527			
	b) Renaissance-1870 with architect			
	c) Renaissance-1870 without architect			
	d) after 1870			
7	Relevant decoration			
8	Original collections			
9	The building appears in the historical iconography			
10	Mention in the Ancient Guides			
11	Mention in the Touring Club Guides			
12	<b>Typology:</b>			
	Historical palace of noble family			
	Villa			
	Casino			
	Tower			
	Castle			
	Theatre			
	Library			
	House			
	Office			
	Industrial building			
	Hospital			
	Barracks, prison			
	Convent, monastery			
	School			
	Small palace, mansion			
	Warehouse, shop			
	Palace			
13	<b>Main category in the land register</b>			
14	Plurality of users			
15	Yearly rent below standards			
16	Generation of income in the majority of the areas			
17	Structural adequacy to different uses			
18	Urban accessibility			
19	Modifiability of use			
20	Private users			
	<b>TOTAL</b>			

#### 4. Final remarks

In more than one sense, it is right that those who cultivate the cultural and historical heritage rebel to the idea that the object of their care suffer the mortification of weight and scores, as described above. Rankings and standardisation are of no help in knowing and analysing arts and history.

Multicriteria methods represent however a compromise (with all the faults of compromises) between qualitative and quantitative approaches. They can help concretely *choice* among different option of cultural heritage policy. What strategic goals should orient such policy? Conservation? Rentability? Employment? A sort of trade-off among the three? And more: where is it most urgent to intervene, given the constraints of the available resources and means? What are the priorities? How the effort must be diversified? How shall we measure performance and outcomes?

There is no need to bother Kierkegaard to say that in this field, today, it is impossible not to choose. Non-choice is the worst possible choice. But choice needs instruments to repel, as far as possible hazard, improvisation, or, worse, the influence of vested interests. One of these instruments is an operational and planning concept of cultural goods, that we — suggest.