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HERITAGE FAÇADISM: AN ECONOMICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL APPROACH

Abstract:
Since the last century Façadism has become an increasingly applied method of architectural heritage. It is a compromise between an economical and esthetical point of view. Architects may take into account the functional design and the esthetical aspect of the heritage. For arts- or architect-historian on the other hand the historical value may be most important. What about the economist’s point of view on this issue? The essay will discuss in more detail about the perspective of an architect, a historian and an economist on Façadism.

Introduction
Throughout Britain during 1970s and 1980s, the trends in Bristol were being reflected in other historic cities the approaches to redevelopment involving the preservation of historic cities (Richards, 1994). He mentioned in his façadism (facadism) book, that much disparaging comment about façadism has been generated from a wide range of interests involved in urban processes, including architects, town planners, historians and conservationists.

The approaches to redeployments involving the preservation of historic facades or the creation of facsimiles in front of new buildings were greeted with controversy and labelled ‘façadism’, which has since been the subject of an emotive debate (Richards, 1994). In this case actors such as historians (arts historian, architects (designer, architect historian, conservationist, urban and town planer, post modernist), and economist involved in this emotional debate where each actor have preferences.

Heritage façadism
“If historical building is transformed or destroyed, it cannot be recreated or restored in its initial shape”. Benhamou, (2003) mentioned that in this point of view, heritage is close to environmental economics. Intervention in Urban Architecture is very multifarious. It includes surrounding groups of people, their lifestyle, customs and beliefs in the past history and the present time. Based on preservation of the existing intervention can include enlarging, emphasizing and bring together surrounding aspects or components in this context façadism is included. Intervention gives space for new possibilities to manifest a buildings authenticity and value. A durable urban environment needs intervention also on a cultural level involving the “living” environments (human culture intervention), redefining its meaning and usage including its environmental economics point of view.

Benhamou (2003) explained that the idea of preserving only the facades gave birth to a very questionable preservation choice named ‘façadism’, consisting in preserving the integrity of facades and freely reorganizing the interior, with owners free to adapt their properties to modern life. As a definition, façadism is a practice of preserving the fronts of notable old buildings while demolishing the backs, often constructing modern interiors behind the old façades. The construction of modern interior building here is usually purposed for a new function for instance; as café, shops, museum, bank and so on. I supposed that those new functions to be result of idea in maximising its economical meaning which required spatial demand and new interior design compare to previous stage. Powerful townscape elements which become redundant, such as historic churches and warehouses, often have to be extensively remodelled inside to give them a viable new life (Richards, 1994).

Actors involve in heritage façadism
In this paper a discussion model as how do economists, architects and art-historian see façadism?, which interest points are in common, which one contradict ?, how did the policy of Heritage Façadism
appear?, what is the role of the economical perspective on Façadism?, Is there a better approach for Façadism than the recently exercised one?, are becoming the main topics.

- Conservationist

In New Zealand, the Wellington Architectural Centre a group which represents both professional and non-professionals interested in architecture and design, and in the promotion of good design in Wellington which gathered in, does not support façadism, and is disappointed to see that a number of entries in the Heritage List note that only the facade of a building is protected. The worst examples of façadism see an isolated facade fronting a building which has no architectural relationship to the designated elevation.

Scale, style and the massing of the new building are often at odds with such token facades. We recommend that the minimum heritage listing for the external facade be designated as “facades and building structure” meaning that the front elevation and its ornamentation and structural detailing are retained, as are the building's side elevations and the building structure necessary to ensure meaningful spatial, scalar and proportional relationships are maintained (i.e. the relation between floor levels, and the facade proportions; the scale of the front to the side elevations) (McCarthy ,2007).

- Art-historian

It has been condemned for causing the divorces between the interior and exterior of buildings and creating townscape which are little more than stage sets. It is condemned by architectural purist as being immoral or distasteful (Richards, 1994). Art historians generally criticize such excise, considering that it implies a loss of culture value (Benhamou, 2003).

- Architect and Post modernist

Aldo Rossi (1931) argued that a city must be studied and valued as something constructed over time. He believed that architecture and its history had created soul for a city. He criticised the lack of understanding of the city in architectural practice and strongly articulated that the city remembers its past, It is the memory collective of its people. I can imagine if memories of one city are deleted, automatically collected memories of the inhabitant are also vanished. With out its histories we may draw closer into phenomenal of lost City, lost of its memory. It is just like when a person is conquered by amnesia. A new term like Amnesia city may perfectly fit to this case where a city with out any single memories, without its roots of histories which may become city without identity. I supposed a city without any identity may lack of its cultural significance. In this case we can imagine if the policy of conservation to expensive to keep the whole historical building, façadism may become the best alternative.

Richards (1994) has examined façadism in the light of a range of architectural perspectives extending between these two extremes, under a threefold structure covering pre-modern, modern and post modern perspectives. Façadism is also considered in relation to townscape philosophy and the three dimensional visual impact of façadism on built urban form, and its inherent visual character and qualities are discussed.

- Economists

Every development decision creates a balance sheet of social and financial cost and benefit involving many different interests. The effect of some forms of façadism can be seen as highly significant in terms of these costs and benefits(Richards, 1994). In the field of cultural economic build architectural heritage has a particular status, Benhamou (2003) mentioned that it shares the preoccupation of sustainability and the existence of an international demand linked to tourism. I believe the relation
between architecture and the city as well as inhabitant and its history are important. The cities history become more and more valuable when it is preserved with its build artefact in this case is architecture monument. The history gives image value to the city with unique identity. Image of containing tremendous memories bring to a specific unique identity, in this case a city able to attract people to come and invest their capital. And it is only happened when an investor really sure that a city has its magnetic power (attract visitor).

If we are to understand fully the consequences of concept such as façadism as part of the complex process of urban change it is important to address such as cost and benefit and their impact on various interests. (Richards, 1994)

Cultural Mining
As an Architect, I expected to see if architect and economist are having something in common. In term of façadism, I am thinking that what architects see as economic way it wills not the same as what the economist might give opinion. Reviving Heritage with economical intervention trough economization of culture, this policy will be including all approach of commercialization such façadism. In this case, The market value of Architectural heritage gives openly potential to property rental, Scientific value and Communication value (social significance of heritage, its aesthetical and commercial value) (Benhamou, 2003). Famous buildings designed by fame architect obviously have high value to property rental. In some case several companies who would like to rent has to win a rental price competition. Preserved built heritage are potentially become massive evident of some scientific purpose in the field of architecture, history, anthropology, sociology, and cultural economics. In this writing I would like to introduce the term of Cultural mining, where façadism become of its sample of it, cultural object become as precious as mineral from under the ground and become valuable when industry involved in it. I believe that this concept also work to all cultural heritages. In durable time rarer built heritage will raise its value. Architecture heritage give historical, economical and social value when proper intervention applied. The cultural intervention will shows clearly how a uniqueness of architecture design as authentic identity can potentially give added value into the cities economy.

Discussion: Heritage façadism valuing (Hi) Story
The purist the opinion by keeping value of whole form of architecture heritage, possibly, has blocked the chance of artefact to be integrated with a new function. A paradox, act such façadism may reduce the value of historical which may effect on its value of archaeological, anthropological and history but economically may work. In this part of the discussion, I would like to give my point of view of Valorisation and devalorisation in the case of façadism. In order to ease in understanding, I would like to introduce assumption story as bellow:
A businessman plan to establishing his business in the city developed very fast where space are getting more limited for a new function (restaurant, modern market, hotel, bank), but within the central city has known for existing of several old housing, he had idea “why we do not modify this house with a new building”. Then he look possibility to build for a new building in the city, the regulation have said that we allowed modifying the old building but have to keep the façades. As a businessman who wants to develop his own restaurant business in the city, so he asks an architect to design that building. The first architect who he visited is purity conservationist, who was rejecting to design intervention to the old building because historical
value reasons, he does not agree to change any single part of the building. Then he went to the other architect post-modernist company, and they agree to design and develop my new restaurant with new design interior with historical façade preserved.

In story mentioned above, Why policy that heritage façadism approach is taken, and what is the certain reasons, there are two things, his story of business and history of the architecture in the city. Façadism in Valorisation of history, the value of past related to historical setting of the existence culture heritage is preserved in order to be evident of history is partial preserved “better less then nothing”, where the market value of Architectural heritage of gives openly potential to scientific value, social significance, aesthetical still able to be obtained. The weakness is will appear devalorisation of the whole complete history, material evident of history including detail history of precession in the interior zoning. Heritage façadism in perspective Valorisation of his story (his plan), significantly able to give commercial value to the heritage object and its surrounding.

**Conclusion**

The value of particular item of culture heritage, for example, is not immediately obvious to everyone. Why save this old building when a new building will so much more useful and economically speaking, more profitable? (klamer, 2003). In my opinion the case of heritage façadism on historical building, appeared as affect of a double (or dual) role economical and architectural object. Where historical, symbolic and authentic value represents by the existence of façade and economical value correspond to the economical generator function of a new interior construction.

The arts historian and architect historian (purist) mostly against the idea and practice of heritage “masking” façadism, though some of architects post modernist totally agrees with this practice as known that heritage façadism is part of post modernism in architecture term. They see as a compromise of past and future of development or maybe in term of cultural industry would call as economization of cultural goods. The work of architect is to design for a building according to demand of their client. In particular case relate to historical building, architects have to encounter with building regulations, conservation charter including related to historical, esthetical, authentically, etc. In other hand the clients expected that the building that being designed is work out for their expectations which possibly as a living, business for generating income, in this case façadism may be part of culturisation of economics.
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HERITAGE FAÇADISM AND ITS CONCEPT OF VALUE

Abstracts:
“In the field of cultural economic build architectural heritage has a particular status”, Benhamou (2003) mentioned that it shares the preoccupation of sustainability and the existence of an international demand linked to tourism. In this essay I discuss about concept of value and some dilemmas of architecture heritage in perspectives of economic and culture point of view. I will point out case of Façadism, to ease understanding the concept of value in connection to cultural policy. I hope this sample will be able to show relation between architecture and its economic potential where the inhabitant and policy makers have to consider a concept of value to draw culture policy.

Introduction
Throsby (2001) mentioned that culture capital exists in two forms, tangible and intangible culture capital. Tangible culture capital as he mentioned can be in the form of building, locations, sites, and precinct. Intangible culture capital in form of ideas, practices, beliefs and value which share by a groups etc. Heritage includes different forms of cultural capital which embodies the community’s value of its social, historical, or cultural dimension. According to UNESCO (1972), the definition of culture heritage has been defined including Monuments: architectural works, works of monumental sculpture and painting, elements or structures of archaeological nature, inscriptions, cave dwellings and combinations of features, which are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science. Groups of buildings: groups of separate or connected buildings which, because of their architecture, their homogeneity or their place in the landscape, are of outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art or science. Sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological point of view (UNESCO, 1972).
In discussion of architecture heritage as culture capital, I like to define it into three elements base on material forms, such as; soft, hard-soft, and hard element. First, soft element which includes (ideas of design, practices, beliefs) it is similar to what Throsby call as intangible form of culture capital. Second, Hard element (massive element) is the identical to definition of tangible culture capital such as building, locations, sites, and precinct. Third is Hard-soft element that combination between tangible
form of culture product such architecture with its authentic unique activities, processions, and ceremonies etc. As an example the house of craftsmanship’s where the small scale industries produce their culture goods in small scale but significant both process of production and the artefact it self. In Asia culture processions such as in Buddhist temple Borobudur in Indonesia or Balinese Hindus temple with its cak-cak dancing for example, it always required specific setting of place. This kind of combination of both tangible and intangible give a chance extraordinary economic potential. The join commotion cultural attraction and its heritage setting are significant. This way of defining in my opinion helps the policy maker to easily combine policies and interventions for cultural goods especially with architecture heritage.

Façadism as Culture Policy
To answer the question of why does concept of value matter for cultural policy? , I like to discuss the dilemmatic concept of value in heritage façadism. In Europe cities like Bristol, Den Haag and Brussels policy to preserve the historical city has concept of trough façadism has been known to be an important issues. Façadism is a practice of preserving the fronts of notable old buildings while demolishing the backs, often constructing modern interiors behind the old façades (photograph 1). The construction of modern interior building here is usually purposed for a new function for instance; as café, shops, museum, bank and so on. I supposed that those new functions to be result of idea in maximising its economical meaning. It required spatial demand and new interior design in comparison to previous stage. In Bristol UK, powerful townscape elements which become redundant, such as historic churches and warehouses, often have to be extensively remodelled inside to give them a viable new life (Richards, 1994).

However not all culture economist agree on the idea of joined project such as façadism. Benhamou (2003) explained that the idea of preserving only the facades gave birth to a very questionable preservation choice named ‘façadism’, consisting in preserving the integrity of facades and freely reorganizing the interior, with owners free to adapt their properties to modern life. In Throsby’s (2001) idea, “the economic impulse is individualistic, the cultural impulse is collective”. He shows the clear disparity between concept of culture and economic approaches. Including the value resulted of both approaches. In practice concept of value in the case of heritage façadism, I believed to be as a combination of an individual and a collective decision.

Decisions as to what counts as cultural heritage and how it should be preserved, restored and/or presented to the public have largely been the province of expert: archaeologist, art historians, museologists, architects, conservationist, museum directors, urban planer and so on (Throsby, 2001). According to them, a heritage building contains essential culture value. Aesthetical value of the exteriors and interiors, Spiritual value: it may have cultural significant to a certain religious faith for
instance in a case of church, social value: the building may convey a sense of connection with in community and create sense of landmark of the place., historical value: the building provide massive evident of human civilization, symbolic value: the existence of architecture heritage may give become represent the social status of the people, and authentic value: original form and shape of interior and exterior communicate the uniqueness. All of those values are giving benefit to individual and the community. To give information concerning concept of value as mentioned above to the policies maker and public become important. The understanding of dilemma issue value of culture and its economic potential hopefully become more proportional and logic. I belief, that this is the significant role of culture economists.

Talk about proportional of value both culture and economic, I like illustrate some assumptions in (figure 1). I like to point out a policy to allow practice of façadism as $C=E$. Conservationist, economist and policies-maker may belief that this is a best compromise to keep value of architecture and cities heritage. $C\geq E$, shows that culture aspect is on favour than economic aspect. It means, when the existing of architecture heritage has scientifically significant consequently to keep the authenticity of the object is imperative. At the end, scientific value may become priority instead of the economic use. $E>C$, figure out about the market value of historical buildings includes the possibility of property rental. The economization of historical building to be main concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Case 1.) Culture value first / $C\geq E$</th>
<th>(Case 2). Economical value first/ $E\geq C$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concepts</strong></td>
<td>Valuing economical use in pragmatic with simplification of cultural value or demolition of architecture heritage becomes totally a new building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying as minimum as possible intervention interior and exterior of building. Keeping as authentic as possible heritage building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic value</td>
<td>Functionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual value</td>
<td>Market value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social value</td>
<td>Technology development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical value</td>
<td>Creating job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic value</td>
<td>No need subsides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Functionality</td>
<td>Less aesthetic value*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Market value</td>
<td>Less Spiritual value*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need subsidies</td>
<td>Less Social value*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Historical value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Symbolic value*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Authenticity value*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* sometime can be opposite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facadism</td>
<td>Facadism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture attractions</td>
<td>Fast Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threats</strong></td>
<td>Site demand in the old city area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead city, no development at all</td>
<td>Vanished of historical city and Heritage evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage crimes: illegal market of historical artefact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig.2. SWOT on Heritage Intervention $C\geq E$ or $E\geq C$ approach, Source: own construction**

**Discussion of which one fist (C$\geq E$ or $E\geq C$)**
Considering both economic and culture value as essential significance, I like to make simulation on how it is works to see what kind of situation practiced policy taken for the heritage intervention. I apply SWOT analysis to figure out the extreme different of Culture oriented approach (C$\geq E$) and Economic oriented approach (commercialisation, E$\geq C$) (Fig.2).

Culture value oriented approach by applying as minimum as possible intervention interior and exterior of building and keeping as authentic as possible heritage building, clearly show, the relation between the audience to the object, give contribution to identity and community building, give chance to have connection with the past give articulation of meaning, shows authenticity, integrity and uniqueness, show the importance for a spiritual community or cultural group.

In other hand Extreme Economic value approach (commercialisation, E$\geq C$), valuing economical use in pragmatic with simplification of cultural value or demolition of architecture heritage becomes totally a new building. Give a chance to maximization of building functionality, technology development and commercialisation able to generate employment.
Common field for conservationist and economist to assist decision-makers
Heritage façadism become an example of joint project of conservationist and economist in maximizing the market value of cultural goods. “In general, heritage as cultural capital can provide a means of integrating the interests of conservationists, who are concerned with cultural value and economists, who look at heritage project as problems of allocation of scarce resources between competing ends” (Throsby 2001). Throsby has argued again that a recognition of both economic and culture value is essential if the two sides of this division are to be joined. He bring up that economical investment appraisal methods designed to achieve to assessment of non market benefits and able to tell us a lots about the value of heritage projects and assist decision-makers to decide a cultural policy.

Conclusion
Concept of value does help to:

- Assisting decision-makers

Often politicians have been forced to debate culture in terms only of its instrumental benefits to other agendas. In political and public discourse they often avoid the more difficult approach of investigating, questioning and celebrating what culture does in and of it self (Holden, 2004). In my opinion, that concept of value is significant to be understand by decision-makers before their involvement in cultural policy. Concept of value gives alternative measurement and solution to dilemmatic cases.
commercialization of culture good. In Throsby’s opinion mentioned that the most obvious locus for introducing culture value into the policy making process is in the drafting of culture policy itself.

- **Help to decide type of intervention**
  The cities history becomes more and more valuable when it is preserved with its build artefact of architecture monument. The history gives image value to the city with unique identity. Image of containing tremendous memories bring to a specific unique identity, in this case a city able to attract people to come and invest their capital. And it is only happened when an investor really sure that a city has its magnetic power (attract visitor). Concept of value is important to decide type of intervention that proactive to attract investor.

- **Carry out Bequest value**
  It is become a responsibility to pass the cultural asset on to future generation. Every town and village has some historic building or site, some collection of artefacts, or some local tradition or custom the preservation of which provides the inhabitants with a connection to their past (Throsby, 2001). Italian architect, Aldo Rossi (1931) argued that a city must be studied and valued as something constructed over time. He believed that architecture and its history had created soul for a city. He criticised the lack of understanding of the city in architectural practice and strongly articulated that the city remembers its past. It is the memory collective of its people. I can imagine if memories of one city are deleted, automatically collected memories of the inhabitant are also vanished. However, from façadism lesson we can learn that sometime we have to make compromise.
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PRESERVING CULTURAL HERITAGE PUBLIC OR PRIVATE

Abstract:
A study case I observed, on one of the former Dutch forth in Indonesia. The private owner wants to build a hotel in the middle of the historical site. The local culture institution, NGOs, inhabitant and expert against this privatisation as it used to be public good. The private who will build the hotel have claimed that he builds the hotel in order to stimulate economical revenue to the city. This essay is starting from my question of in what extend privatizations of cultural heritage become good options.

Introduction
At first I like to make introduce the assumption story, the local government of Surakarta in Indonesia has limited budged to preserve one of the heritage site. The mayor and the city council agree to hand it to a private sector. Private here I assumed one person owner. Private have already owned the site including remains wall of the historical building in and plans to build a hotel right in the middle of the site. The public shows disagreement. The local culture institutions, NGOs, inhabitant and expert against this privatisation as this historical should be a public good which belong to the city’s all inhabitants.

The questions of, what are the different characteristics between private ownerships or government for public goods like building heritage become the issue of discussion. In order to make clear the case, definition of the characteristic of objective and functions government compare to be private in term of preservation.
- Privatization
Private have profit oriented point of view related to their individual purpose. The build hotel plan inside the historical side has intention of profit orientation. Private will not care about the educational aspect of the heritage when it is not benefiting them. However, privatization is often presented as a solution in order to limit public expenditure (Benhamou, 2003). She explained that private involved when the public finance lack of budged. So, the mixture of private and public finance in this case should not be opposed. Mosseto (1994) point out of three different levels for the extent of preservation: re use, (partial) restoration “façadism” and preservation. In the two first cases, the markets work effectively, while public regulation is unavoidable in the third case. The meeting of conservationist in Catania Italia had resulted Catania conclusions in 2007. It mentioned that the share of state-owned cultural heritage versus privately-owned cultural heritage varies from place to place. But, approaches developed for partnerships between public and private should be flexible and adapted to specific situations in the world.

Discussion
- Government role
Government have a role to keep the heritage relate to Non-use values. Keeping the value of culture to the one who not visit it, including people who get information to about the existing of it. Responsibility to protect public right on keeping value such as; bequest value, that the site be preserved for future generation, altruistic value, that the benefit might be motivated by s desire that the site be available for the others to visit, option value, which the current non-visitor may decide to become a visitor in the future, or even existence value, that the site be preserved, even no-one ever actually visits it. Government in this case have responsibility to take care what the public opinion. Government have responsibility to educated the people relate to the information value of historical site, government should not take advantage against its inhabitant. In other hand, private has different another characteristic than the government. The rational economic as it try to maximizing what they may could have.

- Who should provide the budget?
In the case of conservation and preservation often conservationist does not easily trust private to take over the project as they doubt if they keep the quality of culture heritage. Then the next question, if not the private than who should operate the project. If the government give intervention directly through subsidies, there are so many building. Suppose there are some culturally significant sites in the city. Thus, there will be a few to be persevered since the budget is limited. When NGO (Non-government organization) or the CBO (community base organisation) want to initiate preservation then they must gather alternative funding.

- Public values, public preference and expert opinion
Decisions as to what counts as cultural heritage and how it should be preserved, restored and/or presented to the public have largely been the province of expert: archaeologist, art historians, museologists, architects, conservationist, museum directors, urban planer and so on (Throsby, 2001). According to them, a heritage building contains essential culture value. Aesthetical value of the exteriors and interiors, Spiritual value: it may have cultural significant to a certain religious faith for instance in a case of church, social value: the building may convey a sense of connection with in community and create sense of landmark of the place., historical value: the building provide massive evident of human civilization, symbolic value: the existence of architecture heritage may give become represent the social status of the people, and authentic value: original form and shape of interior and exterior communicate the uniqueness. All of those values are giving benefit to individual and the community.

- Non market Argument on valuing heritage
According to Navrud and Ready( 2002), there are three important reasons of non-market valuation on favour of cultural heritage. First, Public values for cultural heritage goods can be provide a strong argument in favour of public funding for those good to be preserved and help decisions over level of funding of cultural heritage. Second, Public preference can help when making decision to decide with building to be preserved. And third, the expert opinion has a central role; to decide type of historical site will receive attention or not. At the end all this approach will be complement to each other.
Conclusion

Understanding how the phenomena of privatizations in the issue of culture heritage this day is the same if how we need to see the contras of human as Homo economicus and homo sociolicus. Human always tries to maximize their economical aspect and in the same time have to facing the social reality of being in the community. Throsby’s idea that the economic impulse is individualistic, the cultural impulse is collective explained properly. Preserve cultural heritage privatization is often presented as a solution in order to limit public expenditure. The concept of privatisation represents a series of complex situations and many meanings. There should be a distinction between private for profit and private for non-profit sectors. As all private organizations is profit oriented organization therefore understanding the value .The public and private contribute more complementary to each other as a tool that contributes to economic growth and social-economic development.
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