

**From Eternal to Global.  
Rome: culture and tourism, but little creativity**

Abstract – Culture, tourism, creativity have become crucial instruments in the global urban competition to attract not only international touristic flows but also people, business and investments. Creativity looks as a leading sector for city economic development and competitiveness, and many are the experiences of urban creativity-led plans and projects all around the world. Tourism, and especially cultural tourism (on the other hand) is no longer a mean of drawing visitors in the museums or tourists in the art cities; it is an instrument to bring up a new city image. The New Master Plan of Rome shows how tight could be the relation between culture, tourism and creativity (creativity intended mainly as atmosphere and style of life) in the strategies of re-launching the city image and competitiveness. Unfortunately, the overall effects are very uncertain. The Plan boosts just few areas of the city disregarding the territorial development potential of the whole metropolitan region. This approach could not only produce little or nil results in terms of competitiveness but also, at the same time, could turn out in new and more dangerous effects in the general development of a metropolitan area with a traditionally strong imbalance between centre and periphery.

Key words: tourism; culture; urban competitiveness; Rome; sustainable planning.

An earlier version of this paper has been presented to the 48<sup>th</sup> Congress of the European Regional Science Association (Liverpool, august 2008)

**Roberta Gemmiti - Department of Geoeconomic, Linguistic, Statistical, Historical Studies for Regional Analysis, Sapienza University of Rome.**

**Address: Via del Castro Laurenziano 9, 00161, Rome.**

**E-mail address [roberta.gemmiti@uniroma1.it](mailto:roberta.gemmiti@uniroma1.it).**

## **Introduction**

Cities are now, and have been for a few years, in the centre of a delicate relationship linking them to the sectors of culture, cultural tourism and creativity. More and more often we learn of new projects or new events about to be realized in more or less important urban contexts, concealing one of the new forms put on by urban competition in the globalization time (Landry and Bianchini, 1995).

Culture has become an essential component of tourism (Urry, 2001; WTO-ETC, 2005), and cultural tourism turned into a mass phenomenon, although constituted by new and innovative components (Smith, 2003). At the same time, culture has become the main source of urban competitiveness and attractiveness (Lim, 1993; Fainstein et al., 2003). As Richards summarized “not only do cultural attractions such as museums and monuments constitute the larger sector of the European attraction market, but they are also increasingly being placed at the centre of the urban and rural development strategies and image enhancement programmes” (Richards, 2001: 3).

Creative industry is a leading sector for the economy of this century, so cities are bound to invest to develop their own creative capacities or, more often, to attract the international creative class (Florida, 2002, 2005; Laundry, 2000). For the cultural tourist, at the same time, the creative experience represents the most advanced attraction: his special attention focuses away from external cultural objects and inflected inwards towards the self (Richards, Wilson, 2006).

Specifically cities and metropolitan areas are the core of the renewed relationship between culture and tourism and of the more composite relation with the creativity sector. The diffusion of strategies, policies and projects aimed at fostering the identity image and economy of the

cities through these sectors have generated a kind of homogenisation of urban cultural and touristic offer.

The spaces homologation process has been largely criticized (Augé, 1995, Ritzer and Liska, 1997; Judd, 2004). It was argued that cities tend to provide similar tourism and cultural goods, which is unsuitable at a time when only originality seems to be a real value added in guaranteeing competitiveness. This is one risk but of course it is not the only one. A certain part of geography (e.g. critical geography) emphasizes the tendency to simplify the social, economic and territorial processes of a city that yet shows marked disequilibria among areas (Chatterton, 2000). To view the urban development as a mere economic process may likely influence the level of cohesion and social equity within the city. If culture is seen as a commercial good, and not as a development tool, investments will be sparkly concentrated on the (historical) city centre to the detriment of the periphery (Zukin, 2004). If a city looks at creativity as an import good, and not as a common heritage to build up, this could generate important distortions in the process of development and valorisation of territorial potentiality within the city itself (Scott, 2006).

Many of this controversial aspects of culture led or creativity led urban strategies are typical of the planning experience that Rome Municipality has carried out during the last fifteen years of elaboration of the new Master Plan. The development model of Rome relies on cultural tourism in the most recent expressions and on the cultural sectors as commercial goods and as components of the new city image.

In the Master Plan the true role of creativity is not plainly expressed, even if it is quite understandable looking at the different projects realized in the last years according to some point of the Florida Agenda (Peck, 2005): a) the landscape up-scaling, through architectural and symbolic intervention; b) the proposal of a creative and cultural city' image especially on the point of view of style of life and atmosphere.

This article is structured into two parts. In the first one it will be discussed the set of possible transformation processes of the cultural tourism and of the relationship between city and culture. The connection is still uncertain and loaded with potentially negative effects for the city as a territorial system. A great need arises to reflect in theoretical-methodological terms upon the different systemic relations linking tourism to culture and city.

In the second part, the development model introduced for Rome by the New Master Plan will be analyzed. The planning approach is to simplify the urban and metropolitan system and to compel the city to liquid models or to well known succeeding planning experiences. The gap between the real development potential of Rome and the model introduced by the Plan is analyzed through a group of statistical indicators depicting the tourism system on various geographical scales. The Plan tries to transfer the touristic potential of the historical city centre to the metropolitan scale; in doing so, it disregards the true capabilities of the whole metropolitan system and it introduces new (and heavier) disequilibria between centre and periphery. This approach is really contrasting with a sustainable and cohesive vision of urban and regional development.

### **The intensified connection between city, tourism, culture and creativity**

When we say that cities are living a new and tighter connection with culture and creativity we have in mind a kind of convergence between urban economy and the culture dominions[1]. On one side, the sectors producing goods and services with a high cultural and symbolic content are more competitive (from entertainment, to personal education, to achievement of a social status). On the other side, culture itself is moreover intended as a marketable good in its different expressions, e.g. performing arts, media, entertainment (Scott, 2001).

In Peter Hall opinion, this is not more that a phase of economic history, predicted by JM Keynes seventy years ago, in which we prefer the good to the useful (2000). The rise of culture and creativity industries , in other terms, would be caused by the particular characters of the learning economy, in which firms, in order to be competitive, must differentiate their products by transforming them into experiences for consumers (Amin, Thrift, 2002).

According to a certain part of economic geography, cities represent the privileged localization of the creative and cultural sectors. Given that innovation is a result of a specific localized interaction between institutions, economy, social and cultural components, the most strategic parts of the learning process cannot be *placeless*. Actually, the

innovative sectors prefer to be localized where they can enjoy a higher level of agglomeration and urbanization economies, a large and diversified job market, a huge offer of high level services, a good atmosphere, a nice place to live (Asheim, Clark, 2001). Innovation and creativity, consequently, benefit of (and contribute to) the complexity of social and economic institutions that are external to the firm but that are generated in a territorial system; and just the quantity and quality of this kind of external economies could explain the localization of creative industries in specific, often planned, spaces within the city (Hall, 2000; Scott, 2006).

Close to the function that culture performs as one of the most important 'new urban economies' (McNeil and While, 2001), this sector has become a wide and transversal instrument of the global urban competition, a mean through which cities redesign their own image. Culture is now the sum of amenities that represent the competitive advantage of the city (Zukin, 1995), a way for increasing tourist flows, but possibly most of all for attracting international investments, financial and human resources (Hall, 2000; Clark et al., 2002) [2].

In this kind of urban development strategies, tourism has become tightly connected with culture through the organization of complex events, structures and symbols, both of great and lesser prominence. According to Evans, "It is with tourism, therefore, that branded arts and entertainment shares common characteristics, since resorts and destinations have long been branded and pre-packaged" (2003: 418). This process of blending between culture and tourism has substantially transformed tourism in these years, with a strong demand of originality, uniqueness, individuality of the experience that make cultural tourism one of the most complex and growing parts of international flows.

It is a process of "culturization of society" which would lead to "more and more areas of consumption been viewed as 'cultural', and that has shifted the focus of cultural tourism away from 'shining prizes' of the European Grand Tour toward a broader range of heritage, popular culture and living cultural attractions" (Richards, 2007: 1) [3].

Especially in large cities and metropolis, culture and creativity find the most complete connection with the tourism sector, becoming a commercial product focussed on external people and capital [4].

Investments in culture, in particular when connected with tourism, allow the city to be more competitive in attracting tourist flows,

investment and qualified people; but above all, especially for cultural events with national and international echo, play a unique chance to communicate, and re-launch if necessary, the city's image and the citizens pride.

In the same attempt, cities invest in the practices of Global Imagineering [5], physically building a city with global feature (Paul, 2004) in order to produce that homogenous and convergent landscape that seems to represent a necessary infrastructure of any international city; the usual practice is to confer to famous architects the realization of State of the Art environments, in order to have a visual code, produced to mark a high development level through places created by hotels, offices, airports, qualified residences, that are functional to the strategic manpower (Sassen, 2008).

In short, a kind of urban competition to have, or to pretend to have, features, culture, functions and landscape of a global city.

### **A relationship with still uncertain effects**

Strictly interrelated, culture, creativity and tourism appear as very powerful instruments for policy makers.

As Richards and Wilson argued recently, "nothing succeeds like success" and cities have become able to 'borrow' ideas from other cities, especially from those which represent global models of culture-led urban development (Baltimore for waterfront, Bilbao for iconic museum, York for the past, Barcelona for the event-led regeneration). Coping succeeding ideas is a quite safe strategy of success (Richards and Wilson, 2006 : 1212).

Maybe for this reason, investment in culture and creativity looks as a "call to action" or a "paradigmatic shift" (Chatterton, 2000) that any city wants to put into practice as an image-enhancement tool (Judd and Fainstein, 1999; Selby, 2004), sometimes regardless of a real assessment of its outcome for the urban economy [6].

Actually, there is still a considerable uncertainty about the overall results of policy makers and planners decisions about 'flagship projects', in the form of large events or iconic buildings.

For instance, about the effects brought by big events to the urban economy there is still great uncertainty, as shown by the recent studies carried out in the “European Capital of Culture” project (European Commission, 2004a, 2004b).

According to the WTO-ETC research, the consequences are always doubtful and often bound to unverifiable factors, including the number of international events occurring at the same time (making sense of the disappointing results for the cities elected in year 2000); although the cities would usually increase their tourist flow by about 50% in the reference year, the effect is of short duration and tends to not outlast the two following years; good results seem easier to achieve for the small art cities than for the bigger capitals.

The economic output of cultural-led strategies are beginning to be really uncertain even for the construction of iconic structures (Richards, Wilson, 2006). The so-called McGuggenheim phenomenon, the diffusion of new symbol of post-modernity such as museums, thematic spaces, towers, statues, bridges, is starting to show his negative effects. Maybe because these iconic structures have lost their distinctive qualities, some recent experiences already suffer of financial problems (Richards, Wilson, 2006).

If economic effects are indefinite, there is even greater uncertainty about the whole repercussion of a big event on urban system, functional asset, social-spatial system, environment, landscape and residents identity. Most research on event impacts tend to privilege the economic dimension of the effects, even if this is limited part of the full range of impacts (Richards and Wilson, 2004).

In the meantime a critic bibliography on specific case studies was made available on the negative effects produced by culture and creativity led urban projects. Studies are spreading about how the big events used as a real spatial planning instrument (Michailidis 2007), can possibly have important negative impacts on the city, also in concurrence with image and economic feedbacks that are generally known as positive.

For Barcelona itself it has been pointed out how culture is still today promoted as an economic sector, and not as a key factor for the promotion of the city’s values and identity (Balibrea, 2001; Monclus, 2000, 2003). Some experiences of re-branding and marketing cities, for example, have conducted to a real distortion of the urban landscape, in the effort to the achieve consistency to the ‘stories’ told about the city by

the brand (Kavaratzis, 2004). Landscape alteration often happens whereas new iconic structures are produced, spaces for local communities are modified and/or subtracted, the centre is re-launched at the expense of the periphery, interventions are made on the social-spatial balance with strong impacts on the identity awareness that landscape gives to the citizens (Beriatos and Gospodini, 2004; Sassen, 2008).

From a general perspective, it has been stressed that the use of culture in order to renew urban economic growth can lead to significant social and spatial distortions (Miles and Paddison, 2005); and this is true either if the strategy is targeted at developing its commercial aspect, investing in products with a high symbolic content, or if culture is employed as an instrument to increase the 'entertainment' and 'experience' opportunities, thus becoming more competitive on the global scale by acting through the tourism 'shop window' [7].

The city practice of competing in projects that link culture with tourism implies the risk of widening the gap between the 'imagined' city and the 'real' one, and the straining of the economy towards a chosen model instead of that recording the development demand that any territory can express. This is especially true in the experience of Rome. Some suggestions on the development model Rome has adopted during the last fifteen years can be helpful to clarify the geographical-economic terms of the problem.

### **Tourism and culture in the model of development of Rome**

The most recent phase of touristic development in Rome starts with the Football World Championship of 1990. On that occasion, there was not a clear mega-event planning model but instead a sum of isolated projects aimed at satisfying the need of a sport event that was supposed to become an element of touristic flows attraction.

The building of huge football facilities was linked to the renewal of peripheral and degraded areas, but what would be a chance for renovation and urban upgrade turned into the Italian traditional 'desert cathedrals' (abandoned installations). This first failure soon proved the need for a better comprehension of the city-tourism relationship and its translation into a territorial development policy and governance.



In the early 1990s the start of the New Master Plan process opened a new season of the city-tourism relationship, granting wide room to the sector, notwithstanding the lack of assessment of the true vocation of Rome, and its identity, to be a city of tourism and (specifically Mediterranean) culture.

It was at this stage that, looking at different best practice experiences in Europe, the planners made a technical mistake that would affect the first draft of the Plan: the premature involvement of Roman Tour Operators and Hoteliers, whose organization, yet not much entrepreneurial and quite close to those family aspects traditionally typical of Roman enterprises, was overestimated. Those we would call tourism stakeholders, in a governance French-style model, in that phase confined themselves to proposals of buildings' maintenance and restructuring (a major subject, since the quality shortcoming in front of a tourism that's getting educated, demanding, first-rate). But the tourism demand characterizing the relationship with the Plan was not clearly measured and, notwithstanding the spreading of studies on Roman tourism, was not correlated with a real policy offer. The great part of the tourism related projects are carried out thanks to the National Law 396/90 named 'Interventions for Rome, Capital of the Republic'; still today, this law supports many investments for the city through following Financial Acts.

From 1996 on, tourism has been related to the Plan's first results, including the 2000 Jubilee event, especially for the following sectors: infrastructures and accessibility; 'green' structures, parks and environment (with municipal farm holidays development projects); service sector development, with public utilities first and then, more recently, with culture and entertainment linked to the urban and metropolitan centres, including a sharp majority of landmarks and big commercial and expositive spaces in the fringe.

In the Master Plan the role of tourism is linked to local development, converging as any other economic sector to achieve the main goal of the Plan: reducing the gap between centre and periphery, producing a polycentric spatial model for the city and the metropolitan region. According to the Master Plan Report, the main guideline is the decentralization of the offer opportunities and a better interrelation between the different parts of the city. So, beyond the city centre (where most of the cultural heritage is located) the real opportunities of touristic

offer, in its different expressions, must be verified and have to become the heart of a different revival of the relationship between tourism and the whole urban structure.

Actually, in a decentralizing 'top-down' process grounded in the 20 local municipalities, the Plan localizes functional mix in selected areas; tourism, in the form of accommodation structures, is for the larger part developed in peripheral or semi-peripheral areas and almost always associated with big commercial areas, public and private office buildings, residential spaces. The functional decentralization is moreover strictly related to the strengthening of the accessibility system, the true fundamental of the development model.

In reality, the sector studies converged into the Plan show the touristic potential of any single municipality, in terms of present resources and possible forms of development of traditional and new forms of tourism; relationship with current or programmed infrastructures; current and potential infrastructures level for quantitative and qualitative accommodation capacity.

But the planning typologies, the chosen functional mix, the localization of the new accommodation facilities and the investments in cultural and symbolic economy of the city reveal their essential aim: designing a new cultural and touristic city where the sole development opportunity for the peripheral areas is to house the symbols of the present city international image, and to offer new cultural and touristic commodities useful to extend the average stay.

### **New icons for a new image**

These strategic aims for the city have been largely realized in the fifteen years of the Plan construction process, through a whole series of activities with significant impact, accomplished through instruments such as Programmatic Agreement and Project Financing.

The city has been divided in different intervention zones: a) the historic city; b) the consolidated city; c) the restructuring city; d) the city in transformation. On this zoning, the Plan operates through the so-called Central Places, that are ordered in three hierarchical typologies: the local (more of 60), the urban (10), the metropolitan (8) (Fig. 1).

The Local Central Places are not interesting for the aim of this paper, because the Plan substantially provides for little improvement into the viability and residential quality of life. Actually, it is through the Urban and Metropolitan Central Places that it sets up the strategy of re-launching city image and competitiveness.

A great part of the Urban and Metropolitan Central Places are realized close and outside of the outer circle highway in Rome (the GRA), and the most of them is on the right side of the Tiber River. The projects are concerning accommodation capacity, new architectural symbols, new functional spaces for commerce (retail and wholesale), new suburban residential areas.

Accommodations are mainly realized through mega-hotels set in metropolitan central places around the GRA, from the east side of the city going to the sea following the Tiber.

Different kind of interventions, realized in the city centre and in the pathway of the Tiber River to the sea, although not providing touristic facilities, show the connection that links tourism with the city and its cultural prominence, creativity atmosphere and economic liveliness.

Many Urban Projects, introduced by Law 396/90 and subsequently implemented into the PRG Technical Rule, have been realized in this area (Fig. 2). Through significant landmarks often projected by 'Star Architects', the Plan designed a new 'core' of the cultural and economic city. It starts with the Foro Italico complex, close to which Renzo Piano realized some years ago the new Music Auditorium, and where it has been realized the representative part of the sport facilities for the 2009 Swimming World Championship. Crossing the River through a new Music Bridge, the cultural 'core' includes the new Zaha Adid' MAXXI Museum and it opens to the historic city centre. From there, the corridor embraces the dismissed Ostiense, General Market and Old Shamble spaces that are becoming a multifunctional space for Universities, recreational activities and culture. This area is conceived as a cultural touristic cluster for young people (a new sort of Covent Garden has been projected) and for the new expression of culture like entertainment and performing arts: it will accommodate beside new University space and public office, a City and a Bridge of Sciences, the new Contemporary Art Museum, the City of Taste, a new Media Library, a Municipal Museum and many other small initiatives. Always on the south axis, the tourist-cultural development virtually includes the EUR quarter that,

since its construction in fascist era, is bound to represent the modern face of the city for those that cross it going from the airport to the historic centre. The new project for EUR consist of the Congress Centre by M. Fuksas, the Finance Towers by Piano/Libeskind, a big mall already realized by Fuksas. In this area, defined as the new Rome Business District, cultural tourism leaves the way to business tourism, that include all the corridor to the sea and to Fiumicino Airport. Here the new Trade Fair of about 186.000 square meters was housed, the Plan foresee the realization of two Towers by Purini for housing and accommodating facilities, and in the Alitalia Magliana central place, a skyscraper of almost a hundred meters to 'mark' the entry into Rome from the Airport. This consistent part of 'Agro Romano' houses these new architectural symbols together with functional space (the Commercitiy, a one million of square meters dedicated to wholesale, plus big shopping malls and outlets).

Very similar to this development model is the approach of the novel Municipal Touristic Board. The most recent initiatives are: a new Theme Park of the Ancient Rome in the corridor to the Airport; a new Aquarium under the artificial lake in the EUR district; many golf spaces in the south out of the GRA; a new F1 circuit.

### **A 'territorial' reading of Rome tourist system**

A general criticism to the development model of Rome arises in a very simple way. Planners seem turn into the elaboration of a model dealing with the city they *would like to have* instead of the city they *do have*, 'borrowing' succeeding experience and pushing in the offer, with the hope that would foster demand. Moreover, the different projects are localized in a definite part of the city, without any clear relation with its own territorial specificity, so the whole urban system is 'broken up' in terms of development opportunities.

In geographical terms this issue could be discussed by looking at the touristic potential of the city at different geographical scales.

By using the traditional spatial indicators at the Municipal scale, Rome with no doubt appears as a tourist region, notwithstanding a whole set of competitiveness aspects that have to improved.

In Rome as a tourism region we actually find:

- A good accommodation capacity, since it houses over 108.000 beds, more than London (104.000) and not far from Paris (over 154.000); considering all forms of accommodation (hotel, camping, subsidiary) Rome offers 83,8 business per 100.000 inhabitants, ranking second to London only (88,2) and beating Paris (72,4) [8];
- Considerable national and international arrivals rates (9% of the worldwide total), although not comparable with London (35%) and Paris (19%);
- An average stay definitely inferior to London's, where visitors stay for about 6,5 days, but perfectly in line with the other European Capitals (Paris included) where the average is less than 3 days;
- A whole series of functions that are typical of the global cities and can attract tourist flows which are not essentially 'festive'. Rome is indeed classified as a EU MEGA, a city that for mass, competitiveness, connectivity, knowledge ranks second to the two European global nodes of London and Paris only;
- A lively economic phase, considering the traditional growth indicators. In the Rome Province (Nuts 3) population grew by 2,3% from 1995 to 2005; the per capita GDP in pps (set at 100 in 1995, is 102,37 in 2005) increased when related to the EU 25 [9]; the occupancy rate that is 59,83% in 2005, up from 49,57% in 1995 [10]; the economic improvements seem to follow the Lisbon recommendations too, e.g. judging by the female occupancy growth (up from 34,87% in 1995 to 51,13% in 2005) and by the reduction in the long-time unemployment (down from 4,2% in 1995 to 2% in 2005 in relation with the working population);
- The favourable climate and the strong investments in the tourist sector start attracting superior functions: this year, after twenty years in Florence, the Congressional Tourism Exchange is held in the new Rome' Fair .

Furthermore, in the specific cultural tourism sector, Rome owns:

- A huge amount of traditional cultural resources, considering that the old town centre of Rome was granted by UNESCO in 1980 the status of World Heritage Site, with a wealth of registered sites

and monuments larger than those of London and Paris, according to a recent study [11]; the same research describes this large wealth as 'highly accessible in multimodal terms';

- A considerable museum patrimony: 32 National Museums out of 193 of the whole Italy [12] ;
- A certain dynamism concerning cultural events, considering that Rome offers every year over 25.000 theatre shows, in comparison with 12.000 in Milan and 5.000 in Naples[13]; on the other hand the Municipal expense for culture has risen by over 40% from 2001 to 2005 [14];
- A good education and cultural supply, represented by 16 Academies with over 225.000 students [15];
- And, finally, a great liveliness right in the cultural sector, with the creations of many architectonic 'symbols', of big and small events: the brand new International Film Festival, to the 'Nuit Blanche'.

If the spatial indicators reveal the image of a region that rightly invest on cultural tourism, the same is not true when trying to perform the same analysis at the territorial scale. The Rome touristic region, in other words, 'can not stand' to a trans-scale reading, and the measure of the current and potential system on the territory can not find adequate and suitable indicators.

When using the just examined indicators, or rather their part available at the sub-municipal scale, we see the image of a central pole with some semi-peripheral or peripheral parts that are functional to the centre.

Indeed the following aspects must be taken into consideration:

- Of the over 11 million arrivals and almost 29 million attendance of tourists in the Rome Province in 2006, 81% and almost 84% respectively are located in the central Department (just 1,1% of the whole Municipal surface area);
- The remainder is arranged in 5 locations: the North-West area (including Fiumicino and Civitavecchia, with a transit area function that can be easily read in the average stay of 1,77 days) with 30526 arrivals and 54063 attendance; the Tiber Valley area, with 4647 arrivals and 10667 attendance; the Tiburtino Sub-Lacense area, with 6497 arrivals and 15043 attendance (it should

be noted that Villa Adriana and Villa D'Este, both UNESCO World Heritage Sites, are located in this area); the Prenestina-Monti Lepini area, with 1169 arrivals and 2565 attendance; the Castelli-South Coastline area with 40475 arrivals and 73664 attendance;

- Inside the Rome Municipality over 56% of the arrivals and 57% of the attendance are in the first Department [16]; two other Departments only (XVII and XVIII) achieve about 5%;
- According to the 2001 census, 71% of the overall provincial value of the hotel-restaurant sector is gathered inside the Rome Municipality, and 29,9% inside the first Department;
- By 2006 catering services in the Province are 3150, of which 1893 are located in Rome;
- On a total figure of 49 National Museum, 33 are located inside the first Department;
- The places authorised for music and various art activities are 634, with 304 inside the first Department;
- Of the overall 449 licenses for public shows, 137 are in the first Department, with important values in the XII (77) and XIII (44) Departments;
- The Universities are spread in the central areas, with the exception of the Tor Vergata Campus.

### **Dedicated to Rome and to the competitive cities**

Talking about the modern architecture, M. Augé has recently noted how «l'architecture mondiale, dans ses œuvres les plus significatives, semble faire allusion à une société planétaire encore absente. Elle propose les fragments brillants d'une utopie éclatée à la quelle nous aimerions croire, d'une société de la transparence qui n'existe nulle part encore» (2007 : 2). Something similar seems to happen in Rome and, probably, in several other cities that have chosen to follow the pre-packaged and most common urban strategies to enhance their own competitiveness.

As stated in the projects summary, the planning liveliness of Rome with regard to the touristic and cultural sector follows two different

approaches. The first one aims at locating big accommodation facilities and post-modernity symbol in periurban areas with specific connotations (Tor Vergata, Eur, Fiumicino-Alitalia) or without (Bufalotta, Lunghezza). In a traditional way, contrasting with the recent urban trend (Evans, 2003), the most important localization criteria of multiplex or big malls in Rome are still the accessibility and motorway interchange typical of the fringe. The second one tends to localize landmarks mainly inside of the city to create two kind of districts: the cultural district, that starting from Foro Italico, includes the heritage of the historic centre and the new forms of edutainment of the Ostiense regeneration area); and the business district, that starts in the EUR quarter and through the new Fair area goes until the south coastline).

Some simple indicators have been sufficient to show what is the gap between the Plan model of Rome development and the effective city tourism potential. Rome is a touristic region just in a small part of a very huge administrative surface. The Master Plan looks at Rome in a very partial view, as composed by a world class central pole and by some axes stretching towards East and towards South and South-West. The touristic potential of the centre is taken as the central point of the whole development model designed in the Plan, where the core is re-launched through traditional and brand new forms of touristic offers; completely dedicated to the functional support to the development of the centre, a large part of the peripheral territories is used to promote this new image of Rome, housing new functions, new symbol, new landscapes [17].

On a methodological point of view, the experience of Rome shows two kind of basic needs:

- Territorial indicators to measure the 'development demand', instead of tourism phenomenon measures of spatial uniformity;
- A trans-scalar and cooperative planning process which would suggest a development model for the metropolitan system on the vast area scale, towards the goal of cohesiveness, competitiveness and sustainability.

The indicators we focused on are not suitable to supply the planning activity with a steady base for determining the strategic lines of the metropolitan area development, from both the perspective of the assessment of the development territorial vocation, and from the point of



view of existing and potential synergies among the different tourist/territorial sectors.

The choice of promoting the city as an international cultural centre cannot be taken regardless of the measure of the real existing potential, through indicators that would provide the planner with the analysis of the environmental, socio-economic, cultural, landscape and tourist sub-systems.

This analysis can not be carried out at the municipal scale, not even in the case of a city with exceptional territory and population. Otherwise there is at least a risk of:

- ignoring resources of great value, as in the case of the large World Heritage sites of the Rome Province and Lazio Region (Cerveteri and Tarquinia in the North and the Villas at Tivoli), which already exist, do not need to be built and are a cultural wealth to be inserted in a hypothetical Roman itinerary;
- Underestimating other resources that simply have never been detected and may be the object of an already expressed tourist demand;
- Neglecting impact indicators that in a trans-scale perspective allow the minimization of the negative outcomes on the socio-economic and environmental systems, which are by themselves pillars of the new cultural system.

Always from the point of view of the demand survey, Rome will be able to contribute to the elaboration of the development programme, starting from the measure of its real deficit in terms of:

- Education and training of the sector employment;
- Upgrading and certification of the sector firms;
- Cultural policies for the population, starting from school up to education 'to the culture' and to 'intercultural';
- Policies in support of the creativity sector, in its different sections that are based on culture and contribute to its development;
- Environmental education, a subject where Romans are still in the stage of awareness acquisition;
- Opening to the culture of 'participation', of empowerment increase, that in Rome still has trouble to take off.

In the simple picture offered in this paper, the development model chosen for Rome is contrasting with the aim of cohesion, because actually it gives development opportunities just to a small part of the

urban system; and it is not really competitive, because it tends to offer cultural and touristic products very similar to other cities. Moreover, the planning approach looks just at the economic competitiveness and not at the more complex and innovative territorial competitiveness approach (Martin et al., 2004, 2006).

So the analysis of Rome planning experience loose to the wider question of competitiveness/cohesion relationship. Competitiveness focuses on the different potentials; cohesion focuses on gap and challenge; it is the traditional 'dilemma' between efficiency (competitiveness as potential and forces) and equity (cohesion, income distribution, job opportunities) (Meijers et al., 2005).

Rome suggests that it is time to leave behind a development model that still approach the centre/periphery relationship in a conflicting way. A true polycentric approach is needed, in which the objective must be economic and social cohesion; natural resources and cultural heritage conservation; more equilibrium in the territorial competitiveness strategies (Prezioso, 2008).

## References

- Amin, A. and N. Thrift (2002) *Cities: reimagining the urban*. The Policy Press, Cambridge.
- Asheim, B. and E. Clark (2001), Creativity and cost in urban and regional development in the 'New Economy'. *European Planning Studies*, 9.7, 805-11.
- Augé, M. (1995) *Non-places: an introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity*. Verso, London.
- Augé, M. (2007), L'architettura e la città nell'epoca della globalizzazione, RISC Seminar, [www.globusetlocus.it](http://www.globusetlocus.it)
- Balibrea, M.P. (2001) Urbanism, culture and the post-industrial city: challenging the 'Barcelona model'. *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies*, 2.2, 187-210.
- Beriatos, E. and A. Gospodini (2004) 'Glocalising' urban landscapes: Athens and the 2004 Olympics. *Cities*, 21.3, 197-202.
- Blake, A. (2005), The economic impact of the London 2012 Olympics, [www.nottingham.ac.uk](http://www.nottingham.ac.uk)
- Chatterton, P. (2000) Will the real creative city please stand up? *City*, 4. 3, 390-7.

Formattato: Italiano (Italia)

- Clark, T.N., R. Lloyd, K. Wong and J. Pushpam (2002) Amenities Drive Urban Growth. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 24.5, 493-515.
- European Commission (2004/a), *European Cities and Capital of Culture*, Study prepared by Palmer-RAE Associated, Bruxelles.
- European Commission (2004/b), *European Cities and Capital of Culture. City Reports*, Study prepared by Palmer-RAE Associated, Bruxelles.
- European Commission (2006), *The economy of culture in Europe*, Study prepared by KEA European Affairs, Bruxelles.
- Evans, G. (2003) *Hard-Branding The Cultural City. From Prado To Prada*. *International Journal Of Urban And Regional Research*, 27.2, 417-40.
- Fainstein, S., L.M. Hoffman and D. R. Judd (2003) Making theoretical sense of tourism. In L. M. Hoffman, Fainstein S. and D. R. Judd (eds.) *Cities and visitors: Regulating people, markets and city space*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Florida, R. (2002) *The rise of the creative class: and how it's transforming work, leisure, community, and everyday life*. Basic Books, New York.
- Florida, R. (2005) *Cities and the creative class*. Routledge, New York.
- Gemmiti, R. (2008) *Creative cities, culture, tourism. The experience of Rome*, Proceeding of the 48<sup>th</sup> Congress of the European Regional Science Association, Liverpool, CD.
- Gospodini, A. (2001) *Urban design, urban space morphology, urban tourism: an emerging new paradigm concerning their relationship*. *European Planning Studies*, 9.7, 925-35.
- Hall, P. (2000) *Creative cities and economic development*. *Urban Studies*, 27.4, 639-49.
- Kavaratzis, M. (2004) *From city marketing to city branding: towards a theoretical framework for developing city brands*. *Place Branding*, 1.1, 58-73.
- Judd D. R. and Feinstein S. S. (1999) *The tourist city*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.
- Judd, D. R. (2003) *Visitors and the spatial ecology of the city*. In L.M. Hoffman, S. S. Fainstein, & D. R. Judd (Eds.), *Cities and visitors: Regulating people, markets and city space*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Landry, C. and Bianchini F. (1995) *The creative city*. Demos, London.

- Lim, H. (1993) Cultural strategies for revitalizing the city: a review and evaluation. *Regional Studies*, 27, 588–94.
- Martin, R., M. Kitson and P. Tyler (2004) Regional competitiveness: an elusive yet key concept? *Regional Studies*, 38, 9, 991-99.
- Martin, R., M. Kitson and P. Tyler (2006) (eds) *Regional Competitiveness*, Routledge, London.
- McNeil, D. and While A. (2001) The new urban economies. In Paddison R. (ed.) *Handbook of urban studies*, Sage, London, 296-308.
- Meijers E.J., B. Waterhout and W. Zonneveld (2005) Closing the Gap: Polycentric Development as a Means for Cohesion. In Davoudi S. and K. Pallagst (eds.), *AESOP Conference 2005: The Dream of a Greater Europe*, Wien, 1-19.
- Michailidis T. (2007), Mega –events, spatial planning and their impact upon lesser metropolises, in the process of constructing a brand new image: a brief evaluation of the Athens 2004 Olympic Games, 47th Congress of the European Regional Science Association, Paris, August 2007, CD.
- Miles, S. and Paddison, R. (2005) Introduction: the rise and rise of culture-led regeneration. *Urban studies*, 42.5/6, 833-9.
- Monclús, F.J. (2000) Barcelona's planning strategies: from Paris of the South to the capital of west Mediterranean. *GeoJournal*, 51, 57-63.
- Monclús, F.J. (2003), The Barcelona model: an original formula? From reconstruction to strategic urban projects. *Planning Perspective*, 18, 399-421.
- Paul, D.E. (2004) World cities as hegemonic projects: the politics of global imagineering in Montreal. *Political Geography*, 23, 571-96.
- Peck, J (2005) Struggling with the Creative Class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24.4, 740-70.
- Prezioso, M. (2008) Is it possible to give more relevance at territorial dimension onto competitive and sustainable policy choices? *Transition Studies Review*, 15.1, 3-23.
- Ritzer, G. and A. Liska (1997) 'McDisneyization' and 'Post-Tourism': Complementary perspectives on contemporary tourism. In C. Rojek, J. and J. Urry (eds.) *Touring cultures: Transformations in travel and theory*. Routledge, London.
- Richards, G. (ed.) (2001) *Cultural attractions and European tourism*. CABI Publisher, Wallingford.

**Formattato:** Inglese (Regno Unito)

**Formattato:** Inglese (Regno Unito)

- Richards, G. and J. Wilson (2004) The impact of cultural events on city image: Rotterdam, cultural capital of Europe 2001. *Urban Studies*, 41.10, 1931-51.
- Richards, G. and J. Wilson (2006) Developing creativity in tourist experiences: a solution to the serial reproduction of culture? *Tourism Management*, 27, 1209–23.
- Richards, G. (ed.) (2007), *Cultural Tourism. Global and local perspective*, The Haworth Press Inc., Barcelona.
- Sassen, S. (2008) Re-assembling the Urban. *Urban Geography*, 29.2, 113-26.
- Selby, M. (2004), *Understanding urban tourism: image, culture and experience*, I. B. Tauris, London.
- Scott, A.J. (2001) Capitalism, cities, and the production of symbolic forms. *Transactions of Institute of British Geographers*, 11.23, 11-23.
- Scott, A.J. (2006) Creative cities: conceptual issues and policy questions. *Journal of urban affairs*, 28.1, 1-17.
- Smith, M. K. (2003) *Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies*. Routledge, London.
- Urry, J. (2001) *The tourist gaze*. 2nd edition, Sage, London.
- WTO-ETC (2005) *City Tourism&Culture. The European Experience*. Madrid.
- Zukin, S. (1995) *The cultures of cities*. Blackwell, Cambridge.
- Zukin, S. (2004), *Dialogue on urban cultures: Globalization and culture in an urbanizing world*. Thematic Paper, The World Urban Forum, Barcelona.

[1] The economic sector of cultural/creative represents 2,6% of GDP in 2003 Europe, higher than the textile sector (0,5%), the food, beverages and tobacco manufacturing (1.9%), and the chemicals, rubber and plastic products industry (2.3%) (European Commission, 2004/a).

[2] “In the middle age, cities were competing to attract the best architects of cathedrals and the most skilled craftsmen. With the Renaissance, wealthy cities attracted the best painters, sculptors or garden designers to celebrate their status. Today cities are making sure they attract ‘creators’ with the goal of boosting the local economy and participating in the success of the new economy. Modern cities are now competing to attract creative talents in a race to avoid marginalisation” (European Commission 2006: 166).

[3] According to Smith (2003: 31) cultural tourism must include: tangible cultural sites, e.g. archaeology, museums, whole cities, monuments; artistic performances, like theatres, concerts, cultural centres; visual arts, like galleries, monumental parks, photography; festivals and events; religious sites; rural landscape, in the form of farms, villages, eco-museums; communities with their own traditions, particularly in developing countries, but also european local folklore; handicrafts; gastronomy; manufacturing industry and commerce, with factories, tours of old navigable channels; modern popular culture, with concerts, shopping, fashion, design, technology; the whole series of specific activities a person is willing to travel in order to perform, e.g. painting, photography. In Italy this process of transformation of the cultural tourism sector led ENIT (the Italian State Tourism Board) to try a different classification, considering inside the segment: a) the Tourism of Territory and Landscape, which would comprise every expression of local culture and identity, also when organized in form of spread museums of cultural and literary parks; b) the Tourism of Entertainment, ranging from cinema to shopping, to events, to theme parks; the so-called New Urban Tourism, characterized by the fruition of urban aggregation spaces, architectural forms and urban design, fashion, art hotels, auction houses; d) the ‘Cultural’ Cultural Tourism, the one more traditionally devoted to historical-artistic, architectural an religious resources linked to personal education.

[4] This phenomenon is shown especially looking at the projects of re-launching cultural tourism in different cities. According to the European Travel Commission and to the World Tourism Organization (WTO-ETC 2005, p. 5), cultural tourism in urban areas develops in three main forms: ‘heritage’, for town and village; ‘heritage+the arts’, for town and city; ‘heritage+the arts+creative industries’, for city and metropolis.

[5] The verb “to imagineer” was coined by the Walt Disney Studios to describe a way of combining imagination with engineering for the concretization of dreams’ reality, specifically through theme parks (Paul 2004).

[6] Pace the economic impacts’ assessment models always preceding and following events. For an interesting account of these models’ application to the most recent experience see Blake (2005).

[7] Scott (2006: 15) clarifies the extent of the social, cultural and economic potential imbalance. For the author, culture and creativity cannot be reduced to the unique problem of income distribution and equitable economic conditions. Actually, it must involve “basic issues of citizenship and democracy, and the full incorporation of all

social strata into the active life of the city, not just for its own sake but also as a means of giving free rein to the creative powers of the citizenry at large". For Scott creativity is not something you can import in the city " on the backs of peripatetic computer hackers, skateboarders, gays, and assorted bohemians". Creativity have to be developed not artificially but "through the complex interweaving of relation of production, work, and social life in specific urban contexts".

[8] Rome Municipality data for year 2003.

[9] In absolute terms, according to EUROSTAT data, GDP at market price was 68.824,70 million Euro in 1995 and 119.757,10 in 2005; in real terms it raised from 78.209,18 million Euro in 1995 to 111.494,48 in 2005.

[10] ISTAT, Survey on Manpower, miscellaneous dates.

[11] According to the Espon 1.3.3 project "Cultural Heritage", which measures this indicator for all European Capitals at NUTs 3, reporting the absolute value of registered monuments and sites per square km and then weighing it in order to consider the 'excellence' resources ([www.espon.eu](http://www.espon.eu)).

[12] Data from National Minister for Cultural Heritage, Cultural Statistics, 2005.

[13] 2003 data from MIBAC-TCI, Culture Yearbook, 2005.

[14] Rome Municipality **Social Account** 2001-2005.

[15] National Minister of Research and University, Survey on University Education, 2006/2007.

[16] Data from Bilateral Office Tourism for Rome and Lazio Region Observatory.

[17] About this specific theme, Rome looks very similar to Athens when Gospodini talks about two kind of landscapes generated by planning: the "landscape of tradition", that is based on the tangible cultural heritage; the "landscape of innovation", the "branded landscape", where the planner use to introduce the new tourism resources through international sign and symbol (Gospodini, 2001).