

G7 Meeting of Experts

“The protection of cultural heritage: Rules, practices, and education”

Florence, March 30, 2017

ITALIAN CONTRIBUTION

CONTENTS

I.	CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES OF INTERNATIONAL REGULATION ...	3
1.	Living with multiple definitions of cultural heritage: the “Infinity of Lists”	3
2.	The (international) legal “entanglement” of cultural heritage	4
3.	Patterns and dimensions of the international regulation of cultural heritage: what opportunities?.....	5
4.	What “legacy” for the future? Lessons from Italy	7
II.	PROTECTION “PROCEDURES”: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES	11
1.	Concrete actions and best practices.....	11
2.	How to prevent illegal activity against cultural heritage?	13
3.	How to collect data?.....	15
4.	The importance of cooperation and.....	16
5.	...and of public awareness.....	17
III.	EDUCATION: WHICH MODELS?.....	19
1.	The voice of cultural heritage in changing contexts.....	19
2.	The new initiatives of the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage	22
3.	Future challenges, international collaborations.....	24

I. CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES OF INTERNATIONAL REGULATION

by Lorenzo Casini (*Professor of Administrative Law and Cultural Heritage Law, Legal Counsel to the Minister of Cultural Heritage and Tourism*)

1. *Living with multiple definitions of cultural heritage: the “Infinity of Lists”*

There is not a common and unique definition of cultural heritage: this is why each international treaty or convention gives its own definition. The system built on the 1954 Hague Convention affects a wide range of cultural property, irrespective of ownership; the objects affected by international regulation of trade and restitutions may vary according to each State; other notions are formulated both at the supranational level (such as in the case of the EU or the Council of Europe) and at the domestic level. In Italy, in 1967, a study commission on cultural property drafted a definition that has been widely accepted and now has been incorporated in the legislation: «Cultural property consists of immovable and movable things which [...] present artistic, historical, archaeological, ethno-anthropological, archival and bibliographical interest, and of any other thing identified by law or in accordance with the law as *testifying to the values of civilization*».

The need for multiple definitions of cultural property is both a challenge and an opportunity in order to better regulate this field, especially for systems based on the idea of a list, such as the 1972 UNESCO WHC. As Umberto Eco pointed out in a famous essay (*The Infinity of Lists*, 2008), lists can express two main different kinds of approaches: one is the finalized “shape”, made of a given number of elements, where listing is a way to portray something closed and limited (such as when in the *Iliad* Homer describes the shield of Achilles); the second approach is the infinite list, created through accretion of things or thoughts connected between each other by any possible link (such as a list of Saints or a collection of treasures). The UNESCO World Heritage List appears to be an interesting mix of these two approaches: there is the objective to identify a specific heritage, which has universal value; but there is also the idea of creating an “infinite” list of sites, each of them outstanding and, therefore, unique. The very notion of list, thus, immediately brings to the fore the dialogue between the global and the domestic level: each UNESCO site represents

what a given State recognizes as one of its “masterpieces”, one of the most valuable of its *national* heritage; at the same time, once added to the list, they become part of *universal* heritage.

International norms, therefore, enrich the set of definitions of what cultural property is. However, the legal notion of cultural property remains a «liminal notion» (Giannini, 1976), i.e. a notion that legal norms cannot define without referring to other disciplines or sciences. This «liminal notion» makes the legal concept of cultural property “mobile”. And this also explains why at the international level each Convention adopts its own definition of cultural property or cultural heritage. These definitions must refer to the concept of (a given) culture and this partially explains the fact that the idea of cultural property – which emerged immediately after the Second World War – seems still “unbalanced”, i.e. dominated by the Euro-American perspective, whilst ideas coming from other cultures have not received enough attention. The increasing relevance of intangible heritage and cultural diversity helps reduce the Western bias in the debate. And the adoption of wide and inclusive definitions, like the one of the Faro Convention, represents an important step forward.

2. *The (international) legal “entanglement” of cultural heritage*

International regulation of cultural heritage, therefore, sheds light on the multifarious relationships between different levels of interests and actors in this field: global, national, local, public, but also non-governmental. Cultural heritage indeed refers simultaneously to many interests, either public or private or both, which can often be in opposition to each other: a) safeguarding cultural property; b) controlling the circulation and the trade of these objects as well as keeping them within the national borders or having them returned; c) keeping cultural property in its original context; d) granting public access to cultural heritage and spreading knowledge about it; e) using cultural property, as occurs in the case of buildings or sites, for other purposes, including religious ones.

All of these interests – which need specific regulation and may often ask for dedicated “definitions” of cultural heritage – may often be divergent: increasing access might make protection more difficult; restricting circulation might reduce

access; bringing an object out of its original context may contribute to its conservation, but trigger claims for its return. At international level, one paradox we see is that the more relevant cultural property is to mankind, the more significant it will be at the national level, and this may increase conflicts between States.

3. *Patterns and dimensions of the international regulation of cultural heritage: what opportunities?*

Since the Second World War, international regulation of cultural heritage and its evolutions moved along three main different patterns.

1) The creation of a world system of protection (based on the 1954 Hague Convention and the 1972 UNESCO WHC), with rules and procedures set by international conventions and organizations and implemented by national administrations. In this pattern, the system moved from a more traditional international legal framework, based on conventions, to a more flexible one, composed of guidelines, policies, and other “soft” mechanisms. The number and variety of actors involved have been increasing, including not only governments, but also international non-governmental organizations and other entities.

2) The adoption of international norms regarding the circulation and restitution of cultural objects (such as the 1970 UNESCO Convention and the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention). Effective international regulation of the trade and restitution of cultural property requires the intervention of several actors – not only States but also museums and institutions – and the adoption of a multi-layered set of norms, ranging from international treaties and conventions to operational policies and mutual agreements. In a certain way, the example of international regulation of trade and restitution of cultural property provides evidence of the limits of traditional international mechanisms in addressing “global” interests, and confirms the need to develop global standards for private actors, as well as museums.

3) The development of international standards for museums and cultural institutions. In this case transnational mechanisms, such as the documents approved within the International Council of Museums (ICOM), have become global, due to their large use and high degree of compliance. ICOM is a relevant example of self-

regulation operating at the global level: an international non-governmental organization that adopts global standards with which members must comply. But the scope of this Code goes beyond ICOM membership, because many countries, such as Italy, have enacted statutes or regulations, which refer expressly to the Code. This pattern stems from best practices in the management of museums.

If one analyses these patterns all together, the international regulation of cultural heritage displays a threefold dimension: *regulatory; institutional; procedural*.

First, there is an increasing law-making activity carried out at the international or supranational level. This regards both public and private actors. UNESCO produces significant guidelines, policies and other norms that implement traditional treaties and conventions. EU and other regional organizations enact specific regulations. International non governmental institutions adopt normative documents – e.g. the ICOM Code – that affect not only the actors involved in the law-making process, but also States or other institutions that are not yet members of the organizations.

From this perspective, the role played by international courts still appears to be too weak. The recent Al-Mahdi decision by the International Criminal Court has been an important step towards a more effective international legal protection. But there are too many aspects of cultural heritage law, which do not fall under jurisdiction of any international courts; and some norms are not even enforceable before national judges. This is why the current effort by the Council of Europe in designing a new Convention on offenses against cultural property represents an ambitious step towards more effective monitoring and implementation mechanisms.

Second, international regulation makes the institutional framework of protection of cultural heritage much more complex. The actors involved are not only governments or international governmental organizations (such as UNESCO), but also domestic administration or other national entities and private actors, either international or domestic or both. There is a plethora of institutions acting in concert in order to balance the numerous public interests connected with cultural property. This of course blurs the dividing line between public and private, producing hybrid regimes. Such situations are familiar to other sectors, especially those in which there

are many interests at stake, such as public health or the environment, where forms of global public-private partnerships have been extensively developed.

Third, international regulation of cultural heritage presents a multi-layered system of procedures. There is a vertical dimension, with UNESCO, ICOM, ICCROM, and other international institutions on one side, and States, domestic administrations and museums on the other. There is also a horizontal dimension, consisting of the relationships between States and of the relationships between members inside ICOM. This is also something common to many other international regulatory regimes (WTO, environment, health, to name but a few).

4. *What “legacy” for the future? Lessons from Italy*

The international regulation of cultural heritage to date has produced significant results, as this dedicated G7 meeting clearly demonstrates. However, this field still seems to operate in isolation, in spite of the existing connections with other international regimes (such as trade or environment). Even trade of cultural property, for instance, falls under the WTO and the EU Treaty, insofar as such properties are part of regimes of exemption that have to be applied by States according to certain principles and rules (such as, in the case of the WTO, the principle of arbitrary and unjustifiable discrimination).

It would be worth strengthening these interconnections, especially in the environmental sector and in the field of human rights. The UNESCO WHC, for instance, represents an excellent opportunity for enhancing forms of closer cooperation between protection of the environment and protection of cultural and natural heritage. The scenarios opened by the Al-Mahdi decision strengthen the important linkages between cultural heritage and the protection of human rights. At the same time, the Council of Europe and UNODC are ensuring more connections between this field and international criminal law and procedures. Moreover, the relationship between cultural heritage and digital technology should be more intensively investigated.

A further issue is how to identify and share best practices developed in domestic legal orders. In almost every State, legislation has recognized the specificity

of cultural objects, i.e. the coexistence of several public and private interests. Due to this recognition, a number of different public bodies and proceedings emerged, in order to deal with such interests. Italy is a prime example of this: it has been dealing with the protection of cultural heritage for centuries, thus developing the concept of safeguarding, protection, conservation and restoration of such heritage as a continuous process of knowledge and research.

Since the early 1900s, Italian laws have built sophisticated legal mechanisms for protecting the cultural heritage, such as administrative proceedings aimed at recognizing the value of cultural property, controlling its use, and balancing all the different interests related to it. The various acts have long served as a model for other countries (such as Spain and Greece, to name but a few, which drew inspiration for their legislation from the Italian law). Furthermore, since the 1960s, the function of protection has been complemented with the function of valorization («valorizzazione»), based on the awareness that cultural heritage should be accessible to the public as much as possible: cultural objects are instruments of culture, knowledge, research, and education.

Cultural heritage law can therefore significantly help develop the existing legal tools of global governance, and establish new ones: some scholars indeed observe that in international art cases new legal techniques have emerged, such as «narrative norms», i.e. «non-binding principles that may have legal effects» and «may be taken into consideration for the interpretation and construction of legal texts» (Jayme, 2005). The way in which different interests are regulated within cultural property law, therefore, can offer interesting solutions in wider contexts, such as the public goods theories.

Cultural heritage sway between international and national legal dimensions, and between universal and outstanding values: one property may be simultaneously outstanding – and extremely relevant to a given single nation and its community – and universal – and significant to all mankind, assuming that culture cannot be restrained within one single country and/or community. As the “first ever” judicial case related to cultural property (Merryman, 1996), *The Marquis de Somerueles* judgment (Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1813), already testified: “[t]he arts and sciences are admitted

amongst all civilized nations, as forming an exception to the severe rights of warfare, and as entitled to favour and protection. They are considered not as the peculium of this or that nation, but as the property of mankind at large, and as belonging to the common interests of the whole species". This is why States must increase and develop any forms of cooperation amongst them and between all the relevant actors involved in the protection and management of cultural heritage.

II. PROTECTION “PROCEDURES”: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

by Fabrizio Parrulli (*Commander of Carabinieri for the Protection of Cultural Heritage - TPC*) and Tiziana Coccoluto (*Deputy Head of Cabinet of the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Tourism*)

1. *Concrete actions and best practices*

In Italy, several concrete actions have been undertaken to combat illicit trafficking of cultural items. These measures can be summarized as follows:

- Adoption of Special laws on protection of cultural heritage (the first of the Kingdom Unitarian dates back to 1902); today, the Legislative Decree 42/2004 and subsequent amendments: Code of Cultural Heritage and Landscape.
- A Bill on “Delegation to the Government for the reform of the disciplinary regulations regarding crimes against cultural heritage” (approved December 23, 2016) is currently under scrutiny by the Parliament. It aims at establishing higher penalties for crimes against cultural heritage and introducing stronger instruments to fight against illicit trafficking of cultural property. In this regard, the measure calls for the new criminal offenses of illicit trafficking, unjustified possession of metal detectors, illegal detention and theft of cultural property and increases the penalties for the crimes of receiving stolen goods, laundering and using money, goods or assets of illicit origin, when the act is related to the cultural heritage. The increase of penalties is also finalized at increasing the number and types of available procedural instruments (arrest in flagrante delicto, summary trial, wiretapping etc.). Reduction of sentences and benefits for those who collaborate with justice and allow the recovery of stolen assets are also rationalized. Then, to make more effective the protection of cultural heritage and landscape, the introduction of the crime of destruction, damage, disfigurement or soiling of cultural and landscape heritage has been planned. The draft law also requires that law enforcement and judicial police officers (specifically, the Carabinieri for the Protection of Cultural Heritage -

TPC) are provided with more effective instruments in pursuing crimes against cultural property. In this regard, the use of some measures like undercover agents and fake sites, already provided for other, serious offences, has been extended to the illicit trafficking of cultural property.

- Establishment, in 1969, of the Carabinieri for the Protection of Cultural Heritage (TPC), a police service specialized in contrasting crimes against national cultural heritage and combating illicit trafficking of cultural property.
- Reorganization of the Superintendencies (field offices of the Ministry of Cultural heritage and Activities and Tourism - MiBACT with inter-provincial or regional competence) in order to achieve better proximity to the outskirts. The reorganization came along also with an overall redistribution of responsibilities within the administrative system of protection of cultural heritage, in particular with regard to specific fields and tasks that involve technical and scientific aspects, such as providing restrictions on areas, inspective powers and enacting regulations and permits.
- Centralized management, controlled by the MiBACT, of authorizations for archaeological research.
- Establishment of Export Offices (18 in Italy, coordinated by an information system that allows them to make real time checks on every item for which export has been requested). Those offices are competent for issuing export certificates and they have the power to deny the exit of items from the national territory and to initiate the process for issuing restrictions on the item.
- Creation, within the public prosecutors offices, of a pool of magistrates specialized in the field of cultural heritage.
- Establishment, within the MiBACT, of an Interministerial Committee for the recovery and return of cultural objects (which includes, among its members representatives of MiBACT, as well as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, Ministry of Justice, Government Legal Service and TPC). Its task is to exercise the so-called "cultural diplomacy", for recovering cultural items illegally exported from Italy for which the judiciary way has suited no effect;

- Signing of Memorandum of Understanding and Bilateral Agreements with Foreign Countries / International Organizations focused on the contrast of illegal trafficking and on the training, on site, in cultural heritage protection.
- Collaboration with the National Office for Ecclesiastical Cultural Heritage of the Italian Episcopal Conference for the census and protection of cultural heritage owned by the Church.
- Involvement of private organizations and associations in projects, communication and enhancement, with a focus on the protection of cultural heritage.
- Organization of coordinated operations between the TPC and the Customs Agency for the screening of passengers and goods in transit.
- Organization of services coordinated at the international level on the fight against illicit trafficking (the last service of this type dates back to November 2016 and was organized within the framework of the EU-CULTNET group, in collaboration with INTERPOL).

Outlined above is the Italian model of protection of Cultural Heritage, based on the full synergy between all actors and the continuous implementation, improvement and development of cultural heritage management, preventive and repressive actions for contrasting criminal threats and recovery of stolen assets.

The MoU and agreements concluded with USA and Switzerland are among the most significant best practices due to their effective implementation and the concrete results achieved, with the restitution to Italy of thousands of illegally exported and stolen cultural objects.

2. *How to prevent illegal activity against cultural heritage?*

To prevent theft of cultural property it is considered appropriate:

- Proceeding to the complete cataloguing of movable and immovable cultural heritage (immovable cultural heritage can be fractioned and made movable), the detailed knowledge of which is the essential condition for:
 - preventing subtractions;

- enabling searches in national and international fields with the aid of data and images that allow the unique identification of the goods.

Catalogues and inventories must be checked regularly to identify immediately “misplaced” items. It happens frequently, especially for archival documents and books, that the missing items are identified long after their actual disappearance;

- Providing regular monitoring of terrestrial and marine archaeological sites, carried on by specialized police services and in collaboration with the Superintendence, but also involving other police departments that perform regular police duty;
- Carrying out inspections in cultural sites (museums, libraries and archives) in order to test the overall system of anti-crime security and to provide expert advice for its implementation. This activity, in Italy, is performed by the TPC, which has adopted a standardized survey form, with required fields (check-list) and free-response;
- Publicizing the Object-ID as a standard cataloguing system for private property, so that in case of theft all the relevant information for the research are ready for use;
- Promoting studies and research aimed at identifying systems for identification and traceability of cultural goods.

Illegal export can be contrasted through:

- A system of offices in charge of handling export requests, subject to the competent national central cultural heritage Authority and connected with an information system. Direct link with a specialized police service would be useful for:
 - Verification of the provenance of property proposed for export (see if the item is searched for because unlawfully removed);
 - Inclusion of all items for which the export denial was issued, in a dedicated archive ;

- The securitization (anti-counterfeiting and anti-forgery) of the certificates and licenses that authorize the export of goods;
- Publicity of a red-list of the types of goods for which the involvement of Export Offices is mandatory ;
- Customs checks on passengers and goods in transit, in collaboration with the police service specialized in the protection of cultural heritage.

Illegal traffic and illicit export of cultural property are usually not considered major crimes within countries that have not established specific police services. As a consequence, the requests for information / activities transmitted via INTERPOL or EUROPOL, are not considered as a priority vs. those for other major crimes. This provokes difficult communication and late responses that often require more than one request for the same instance. Lack of the activations in the field may determine lack of knowledge in the operators on “how to comply” with the request because procedures and contacts have to be rebuilt each time, with extreme efforts and poor results.

3. *How to collect data?*

All the information concerning crimes involving Cultural Property and reported to the Carabinieri Command for Protection of Cultural Heritage are stored within the “Database of illegally removed cultural artefacts”, managed by the TPC. The data are reported by the Departments of the Carabinieri, the other police forces and, ultimately, by Italian and foreign accredited bodies (more than 6.2 million objects are counted and more than 618,000 images are recorded).

Whenever a citizen reports a crime concerning cultural property, the proceeding police force fill a standardized form - “TPC Event card” - (which includes the Object-ID and all police data pertaining to the event). The form is then sent to the TPC that process the information and digitalize the entry for the consequent activation of the research.

For items of major significance the data is forwarded to INTERPOL to feed its "Stolen Works of Art Database". A project called PSYCHE (Protection System for Cultural HEritage), funded by the European Union and managed by the TPC as project leader, has already been handed over to INTERPOL and, when activated, will allow a more rapid and effective communication at the international level about all the stolen items .

The database is managed by a dedicated section of TPC. A branch of it performs data feeding and a second branch performs regular checks on e-commerce, auction catalogues and furthermore on all the items verified during the regular controls conducted on antique dealers by the TPC local Units.

4. *The importance of cooperation and....*

International cooperation is fully satisfactory with the countries in which specific police services are present and with those who, despite the absence thereof, have dedicated specialized units of regular police forces to the task.

The assimilation of the "culture of restitution" at all levels of society (Government, judiciary power, police forces and ministerial authorities) is the crucial element to overcome every difficulty.

Procedures, on both the Police and the Judiciary channel, are adequate. The main problems are related to:

- Qualification of crimes in different legal systems. Charges do not always find correspondences, especially if the of the two countries involved has a special legislation while the other does not. E.g. some states do not recognize illegal exportation of cultural property as a criminal act;
- many countries involved in illicit trafficking have not yet ratified the most important international conventions on illicit trade (in particular, UNESCO 1970 and UNIDROIT 1995).

5. ...and of public awareness

Raising public awareness about the value of cultural property and the threat to the cultural heritage created by theft, clandestine excavations and illicit exports is one of the key practice recommended in the UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property signed in Paris in 1970 (art. 10 letter. B) as well as, more recently in the Faro Convention. This objective can be effectively reached through the involvement of local communities and education of future generations.

Furthermore, publicity about the restitution of illegally removed artefacts could work as a deterrent for crimes. In this perspective, the Carabinieri Command for Protection of Cultural Heritage has always considered awareness raising initiatives as part of its tasks. Many exhibitions have been organized, both in Italy and abroad, showing the masterpieces recovered, the stealing techniques and the possible countermeasures.

In addition, the TPC participates in a program run by the Ministry of Education, University and Research and by the Carabinieri for spreading the culture of legality, organizing conferences in schools with its qualified personnel.

The command have also created the application "ITPC" designed for those who intend to approach the art market or have experienced theft of cultural property. It is an app designed for mobile devices of the latest generation, which offers the possibility of:

- Searching and consulting more than 22,000 cultural items of high value (archaeological finds, paintings, sculptures, ecclesiastical items, library materials), extracted from the "Database of illegally removed cultural artefacts";
- Carrying out a real-time comparison between the image of a work of art taken with the camera of the device and the public selection of missing items;
- Accessing to the Object-ID Wizard, to rapidly create it;
- Referring to "advice to the citizen" section dedicated for the following FAQ of "what to do":

- in case of purchase of cultural goods;
 - in case of theft;
 - if you become aware of a clandestine excavation;
 - if an archaeological item it is found by chance;
 - to avoid buying counterfeit objects of cultural interest.
- Obtaining information on the location of the nearest TPC office, responsible for the area.

III. EDUCATION: WHICH MODELS?

by Maria Luisa Catoni (*Professor of Ancient Art History and Archaeology, Director of the School of the Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Tourism*)

1. *The voice of cultural heritage in changing contexts*

The increasing awareness of the crucial role that cultural heritage plays in contemporary societies as a driving force in fostering knowledge, innovation, conscious citizenship, respect for diversity, intercultural dialogue, peace-keeping, economic and social growth, is reflected in the growing attention governments, societies and international governmental and non-governmental organizations devote, on the one hand, to ensure the presence of cultural heritage in the national educational programs and, on the other hand, to promote the development of specific academic and technical training programs in the field of cultural heritage protection and conservation.

It must be reminded that, while intangible cultural heritage is, at least partially, included in a certain number of humanities-related disciplines that are generally taught in primary and secondary schools in many areas of the world, a specific attention to tangible cultural heritage, world heritage and the values connected to their knowledge, conservation and preservation seems less evenly present and formalized within national schools' programs. These aspects are, instead, most often approached within specific post-secondary training and academic programs.

It must also be reminded that international and non-governmental organizations such as UNESCO, UNIDROIT, ICOM, ICCROM have since long been promoting both inclusive, multiplatform and multilevel educational initiatives aiming at developing cultural literacy and cultural heritage awareness, and specific training programs aiming at equipping professionals with the necessary tools and skills to operate in the field of protection, conservation and restoration of cultural heritage. One of the greatest merit of these initiatives is their firm commitment and strong effort to involve a multiplicity of actors (school teachers, universities, academies, scholars, private

actors, professionals, students, citizens) and to approach the issue of lifelong education.

A wide theoretical agreement seems to exist that education and professional training play a key role in ensuring a future to cultural heritage.

Four aspects deserve particular attention:

1) Whatever measures are established to protect cultural heritage from criminal offence, improper/illegal use, neglect and oblivion, their concrete implementation becomes possible and sustainable only if they hinge on a widely spread awareness of the civic, social, cultural, symbolic and economic value of cultural heritage. Educational systems and awareness initiatives, then, should be aimed at increasing the number of highly aware stakeholders, from international organizations, to governments, to citizens. The participation of citizens and local communities in the activities of monitoring, protecting, preserving and managing cultural heritage, proves crucial in this perspective.

2) Traditional and new modalities of both cultural enjoyment and cultural spending in the developed and developing countries show that cultural heritage and cultural enjoyment could represent today an important element of social and sustainable economic growth as well as a significant trigger of political, societal, technical and technological innovation. This multiplicity of patterns of cultural heritage enjoyment represents both a great opportunity and a challenge: on the one hand, it can (and often does) concretely produce a clash amongst potentially conflicting interests; on the other hand, it can trigger both political, educational, technical and technological innovations aimed at meeting traditional and new expectations related to cultural heritage and new entry points for the comprehension of the needs and rights of specific communities and audiences in regard to cultural heritage.

3) The very existence and the future of cultural heritage rest on its capacity to keep voicing the values, meanings and habits it embodies and carries, in the context of ever-changing contexts, which are moreover and by definition, profoundly different from the ones that produced it. From this point of view, cultural heritage embodies, by its very definition, the inherent and potentially fruitful tension between stability and change. Such a capacity of cultural heritage to keep voicing values, meanings and

habits is always rooted in the present time. It is a dynamic and never-ending process, which rests primarily on the existence of sets of largely shared values (dynamic and ever-changing in their turn). Research and education are the primary tools for granting cultural heritage its audible voices, ultimately justifying its preservation and enabling us to maintain it alive for future generations. Education includes, in this context, research, school programs, academic and training programs, lifelong education and initiatives aiming at promoting and disseminating knowledge and awareness.

4) Cultural heritage preservation and management is a complex domain, to which numerous and very diverse disciplines contribute specific, crucial competencies. Several national and international academic and training programs exist in many areas of the world, which formalize definite sets of technical skills and tools to research, conserve, protect and restore cultural heritage. The aspect of cultural heritage management, though, seems less developed at the level of both academic and training programs. It is precisely the widely acknowledged complexity and specificity of the field to suggest that the traditional economic, management and organizational disciplines do not provide all of the necessary tools to manage cultural heritage, which, instead, requires specific management models and tools and well trained professionals. Training programs in management of cultural heritage have, therefore, to be markedly interdisciplinary and carefully include core and content-related curatorial knowledge, historical, philosophical, sociological and political culture, juridical and administrative culture and tools, technological and management skills. Cultural heritage, on the other hand, can represent a highly valuable experimental field, in which innovative management models and tools to govern complexity in general can be designed, and managers of complex systems can be adequately trained. Complexity is and will be one of the identifying marks of the challenges of our and future times: cultural heritage and its management embody at best such a complexity.

2. *The new initiatives of the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage*

Research, technical and curatorial skills are traditionally and formally ensured, in Italy, by Universities, Academies and by a small number of highly prestigious and internationally active Institutes belonging to the Ministry of culture (Istituto Centrale per la Conservazione e il Restauro del Patrimonio Archivistico e Librario; Opificio delle Pietre Dure; Istituto Superiore per la Conservazione e il Restauro), to which seventeen archival Schools (Scuole di archivistica, paleografia e diplomatica) should be added.

The 2014 reform of the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Tourism brought about important innovations, also in the field of education and training. While enhancing, through substantial additional funding, the international activities, inclusive of conservation and restoration training programs, performed by its Institutes both in Italy and abroad; and signing important protocols with the Italian Ministry of Education, Research and University aimed at increasing and widening the knowledge of cultural heritage among primary and secondary schools' students, the 2014 reform reflects two important political and cultural choices:

- a) the establishment of a General Directorate of Research and Education;
- b) the establishment of a new School, named the Scuola dei beni e delle attività culturali e del turismo (hereinafter, "the School").

The two initiatives perform complementary activities and are designed to work in strict collaboration.

The School, in particular, will offer two multidisciplinary training programs specifically designed to concretely equip future operators both in the public and the private sectors with the necessary skills and tools to manage and govern the complexity of cultural heritage.

The School will offer two main programs.

- 1) The Scuola del Patrimonio is a two-year higher education program, which will insert interdisciplinary competences in a solid core of pre-existing technical and curatorial skills (post 5+2 university degree or equivalent experience).

A first module of teaching is common to all students; it aims at providing them, mainly through inductive and laboratorial teaching techniques, with competencies in the fields of juridical and administrative law; management, risk-management and organizational techniques; environmental risk management techniques; museology, curatorial and conservation strategies; funding models and fund-raising; technological tools for protection, organization and communication; communication techniques; history of the formation of cultural heritage, mainly in Italy and Europe; tourism management.

A second module is organized into six different curricula, each designed on the basis of the professional profiles elaborated at the national (and international) level to hold executives offices in the different branches of cultural heritage protection, conservation and management, both within the (mainly Italian) public and the private sector.

A third module envisages a long period of internship at one of the many nodes of the immense net of the Italian cultural heritage offices, institutes and sites.

2) The International School of Cultural Heritage is an eighteen-month program reserved to international students and can be accessed after acquiring a 3+2 university degree.

A first module of teaching includes historical disciplines and some of the disciplines present in the first module of the Scuola del Patrimonio program.

A second module is organized into six different curricula, which correspond to traditional disciplines (Restoration and Conservation; Archaeology; Art History; Libraries and Archives; Museum Management; Territorial Management).

A third module, again, envisages a long period of internship at one of the many nodes of the immense net of the Italian cultural heritage offices, institutes and sites.

Apart from its institutional training programs, the School promotes and performs research on cultural heritage, also acting as an Institute of Advanced Studies, which will invite national and international scholars and professionals for definite periods of time.

In addition, the School will organize, in collaboration with Universities, International organizations and private actors, awareness raising initiatives, training programs for school teachers, professional training programs and specific courses for professionals, who are already enrolled in the Italian administration of cultural heritage.

The overall aim of the School is to turn a specific character of the Italian cultural heritage, that is its dense distribution on the territory and strong link with individual territorial cultures, into an effective tool for promoting research and innovation in the field of cultural heritage and a physical training ground for training managers of cultural heritage and, more generally, managers of complex systems.

3. *Future challenges, international collaborations*

No national training program can effectively address, in isolation, the problem of how to appropriately train experts, who are able to deal with (world) heritage as a tool for intercultural dialogue and peace-keeping.

The Italian cultural heritage certainly presents an exemplary complexity, in terms of diversity, density and distribution, which has produced, for centuries, reflections, technical competencies and attempts at elaborating the most appropriate curatorial and management models to govern it. Such knowledge, especially in the fields of conservation and restoration, has at times been put at the service of peacekeeping (e.g. through the "Unite for Heritage" campaign) and formalized into training programs both in Italy and abroad. Other countries (such as France and Germany) and international organizations (such as UNESCO, UNIDROIT, ICOM and ICCROM) have been commendably very active in devising ways to face the same problem.

It could be taken into consideration, though, to cluster all these experiences together and establish an International School or Program, with regionally based modules and curricula, specifically aimed at providing future operators in this specific sector of cultural heritage, which represents a paramount present and future challenge, with the necessary skills and competencies.