

Disintegration of Italian rural landscapes to international environmental agreements

R. Guarino¹ · F. Cutaia² · A. L. Giacobelli² · P. Menegoni³ ·
F. Pelagallo⁴ · C. Trotta^{3,5} · G. Trombino²

Accepted: 11 October 2015 / Published online: 16 October 2015
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2015

Abstract In Italy, the first law that puts landscape and historical buildings under public control was implemented in 1922. While this represents a significant achievement for those times, for that law landscape essentially has an historical and aesthetic connotation, without any explicit reference to the components of flora, fauna and geology. Today, many protection policies and initiatives are still biased by the lack of reference to the intrinsic value that biodiversity and ecosystem services have for the maintenance of traditional landscapes, as well as for the survival of the human species. The priority accorded to historical and aesthetic values can lead to a lack of attention to the complex relationship binding the natural environment, agriculture and urban processes. Hence, there is a need in

✉ R. Guarino
guarinotro@hotmail.com; riccardo.guarino@unipa.it

F. Cutaia
fabio.cutaia@virgilio.it

P. Menegoni
patrizia.menegoni@enea.it

F. Pelagallo
f.pelagallo@abadvisory.it

C. Trotta
trotta.claudia@gmail.com

G. Trombino
giuseppe.trombino@unipa.it

¹ Department of STEBICEF, University of Palermo, via Archirafi 38, 09123 Palermo, Italy

² Department of Architecture, University of Palermo, Viale delle Scienze, Ed. 8, 90128 Palermo, Italy

³ ENEA UTAGRI – ECO (gestione sostenibile degli agroecosistemi), Via Anguillarese 301, 00123 S. Maria di Galeria, Rome, Italy

⁴ Faculty of Economy, University of Rome-Tor Vergata, Via Columbia 2, 00133 Rome, Italy

⁵ Forum Plinianum, via Lavinio 22, 00183 Rome, Italy

Italy for an increased awareness of the functional role exerted by agriculture as a link between ecosystems and “techno” systems. The complex and polysemic concept of landscape plays a crucial role in designing new strategies for the rural territories, their economies and their cultures. Moving towards a shared and integrated strategy for multifunctional agriculture involves a substantial revision of the general objectives of growth and development, combining conservation and innovation. In this respect, the full integration of the Strategic Environmental Assessment in regional planning processes is one possible method for building a framework in which policies to promote the development, protection and enhancement of landscapes can work in an integrated way. These observations lead to some final conclusions on the network logic which should drive the integration process of planning and evaluation, along with some reflections on the Italian programme for inland areas.

Keywords Landscape protection · Agriculture · Ecosystems · Biodiversity · Regional planning · SEA · Inland areas

1 One landscape, multiple vocations

The period between the second half of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries saw the spread of a new awareness in North America and Europe of deep territorial changes caused by industrialization.

One of the first scholars who observed the relationship between human beings and the surrounding environment was active in this period. We refer to G.P. Marsh and his work “Man and Nature” (1864). This is most certainly an original work, unmatched in his age. In fact, Marsh published his observations on natural phenomena after a long study around the world and, especially, in Italy. He described the landscape transformations due to human action on the natural environment, pre-empting many decades in advance the ideas of the French geographer J. Brunhes and those of the German E. Fels. Marsh was able to predict that human beings could jeopardize their life on this planet because of the modifications caused to the landscape in which they are living. This new acquired awareness gave rise to the first spontaneous movements for the defence of landscape, which became promoters of the first protected areas (McNeely 1994). In those times landscape, marked by pre-industrial human history, acquired a cultural value.

The Italian Constitution (Article 9) protects landscape, considering it in terms of its beauty and moral value, which acts as a glue between generations, as a cultural value bequeathed by our ancestors and as an historical value to be transmitted to future generations.

But the roots of landscape protection have to be sought further back in time. In fact, in Italy the first law that puts landscape and historical buildings under public control was implemented in June 1922. While this fact was a significant achievement for those times, one should bear in mind that Act of Parliament no. 778/1922 considers landscape essentially for its historical and aesthetic connotations, since its protection was invoked because of its exceptional beauty or its special links with civic and literary history, without any explicit reference to the components of flora, fauna and geology. The “natural beauty” concept, at the basis of this law (“Protection of natural beauty and historical buildings”) later inspired Act of Parliament no. 1407/1939 (“Natural Beauty Protection”) and also

deeply influenced Act no. 431/1985 (the “Galasso Act—Urgent measures for the protection of areas of particular environmental interest”) and Act no. 42/2004 (“Code of the Cultural and Landscape Heritage” and subsequent adjustments in 2006 and 2008).

Even today, more than 20 years after Act of Parliament no. 394/1991 which regulates the establishment of protected areas, the collective imagination still seems relatively unaware of the intrinsic value that biodiversity and ecosystems services have for the survival of the human species. Similarly, in spite of huge portions of our territory being occupied by farming land, few are aware of the functional role exerted by agriculture, as a link between ecosystems and “techno-” systems. Until the present time, ecological networks were designed exclusively in terms of hedgerows and rivers, as if the fields had the sole function of producing food for humans. This has certainly been abetted by the progressive depletion of complex cropping systems in favour of an agricultural landscape that is desolately homogeneous, marked by the cultural homologation imposed by the global market. Therefore, many cropping systems of great ecological, historical and aesthetic value are disappearing, along with the imprint “that man, in the course and for the purpose of agricultural production, consciously and systematically gives to the natural landscape” (Sereni 1972, p 3).

2 How long is Italy going to last?

“(…) This is the question—a question which is only apparently paradoxical—being asked by town planners, statisticians, environmentalists and so on. They are beginning to reflect upon the frenetic pace with which, in the legal morass and the inability to plan effectively, we go on consuming that precious, limited and never-to-be reproduced resource that is the Italian landscape” (Cederna, 1983, p 23).

In Italy, landscape consumption was for a long time facilitated by a clear separation of institutional powers between bodies for the protection of nature and landscape, territorial development planning and agriculture and forestry policies. Moreover, the acceptance of the notion of landscape as an object of aesthetic contemplation has meant that we pay more attention to the preservation of its physiognomy than to the interpretation of its physiology (Turri 2000). In fact, the attention of scholars and, above all, of technicians has been focused more on the appearance of the landscape than on its “structure”, constituted by geological, morphological and ecological features as well as historical, perceptual and social values (Küster 2010). All these elements must constitute the object of future policies and actions concerning the landscape (Paci 2008; Colantonio Venturelli et al. 2009). Accordingly, the lack of a global landscape vision, in Italy and many other regions of Europe, has caused the proliferation of single protectionist acts instead of total protection based on strategic planning and policies, as well as a general lack of coordination between regional planning and landscape planning. This results in a separation of commercial production areas from those aesthetic and recreational ones and gives rise to the current disintegration of the Italian landscape.

Agriculture, which contributes so much to the character of the Italian countryside, is located in between two opposing vocations: on one side, that of the agro-industrial sector, with its associated externalities; on the other, that of the maintenance of rural landscapes and cultivars of great cultural identity and value. The balance between these two tendencies is strongly influenced by the market and by subsidies to agricultural

production, disbursed in the attempt, so far unsuccessful, to (re-)establish systems able to develop endogenously (Guarino and Menegoni 2010).

Until the recent past, agro-silvo-pastoral practices induced the prevalent imprint on the Italian landscapes (Krzywinski et al. 2009; Agnoletti 2011): traditional small-scale farming contributed to the development of highly complex socio-ecological systems, which are only partially known and investigated (Agnoletti 2014). Currently, many traditional landscapes suffer abandonment or, worse, the imposition of new transformations to which we refer with numerous neologisms: *coastalization*, *urban sprawl*, *gentrification*, etc.

In the following paragraphs, some considerations will be made regarding the relationships that bind agriculture, the environment and town planning, focusing on aspects that are considered essential to achieving a better integration of these three key components of regional planning.

3 Towards agriculture

More than 10 years ago, at the 2000 Lisbon Summit, the European Union proposed a new development strategy, where the economic future of the continent would be based on a “knowledge economy” (Rodrigues 2003; European Commission 2005). This strategy was an attempt to respond to the migration of the production of material goods from the European Union to countries with lower labour costs. This left the more advanced economies with the need to compete with intangible goods and services, such as financial services, information and communications, while becoming a centre for both culture and technical innovation (Amidon et al. 2005).

There were three pillars to the Lisbon Strategy: economic competitiveness based upon a knowledge economy, combating social exclusion through education and achieving a thriving economy combined with environmental sustainability. The Lisbon Agenda Strategy also contained ambitious targets: by 2010, Europe was to be the most innovative area on the planet, with 70 % employment rate and 3 % of GDP spent on research and development. In reality, the industrial base continued to move elsewhere, while the “workshops of knowledge” envisaged by the Strategy did not develop according to the expectations (European Commission 2010a). Those industries remaining in Europe have invested little in research and innovation. In spite of the many indicators proposed in the Lisbon Strategy, purchasing power still remains the only parameter associated by the public with the idea of well-being.

The Strategy had failed well before the Global Economic Crisis of 2009, which may largely have been due to the fragmented approach to the delivery of the objectives. This was combined with a lack of effective leadership and the inability to carry out the goals of the Strategy while still respecting the differences between Member States (Hesmati and Oh 2006; Tilford and Whyte 2010). The European Commission recently attempted to relaunch the Lisbon Agenda with the document “Europe 2020—A Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth” (European Commission 2010b). Some of the objectives identified in this document such as a less than 10 % school dropout rate, 40 % of young people as university graduates and the “20/20/20” targets for climate and energy¹ are welcome. However, it is doubtful that these targets will be met.

¹ The environmental targets adopted by the European Council include the so-called three 20 targets, i.e.: to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by 20 % by 2020 (taking 1990 emissions as the reference); to increase energy efficiency to save 20 % of EU energy consumption by 2020; and to reach 20 % of renewable energy in the total energy consumption in the EU by 2020.

Once again, the 2020 Strategy seems more a wish list, which fails to take into account the specific diversity of a territory and continues a bias towards industrial and technological development.

Given the failure of the Lisbon Strategy, it would have been more desirable for the revised 2020 Strategy to focus on developing territorially specific economic activities that are less easy to move than factories, such as high-quality agriculture. At the same time, it could become a powerful tool for promoting a territorial culture that gives value to products, landscapes and the network of human relationships. Landscapes and territorial arrangements generally reflect the dynamism related to social and economic changes. Our economies are economies of landscapes—economic processes that feed and are based on the material that man arranges through technological tools. Human action is unthinkable without a landscape previously built by human action itself (Wescoat and Johnston 2008).

The 2020 Strategy, in its revision of 2005, could and should aim to recreate (in a modern and highly integrated way) the rural way of life that was predominant in pre-industrial Europe. As a matter of fact, in the Strategy, rural development is seen as a mere by-product of investing in high skill service economies. This lack of specific programs affects, as well, two other important strategic documents produced (1) by the Council of Europe: the European Landscape Convention (ELC), released on July 2000 and (2) by the European Commission: the set of legal proposals to reform the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), issued in 2011 after an extensive public debate.

Although in both documents the development of agriculture goes along with the enforcement of a territorial culture, the cultural and historical contents of landscapes are often reduced to their representations, or visual perceptions (Moreno and Montanari 2008). This kind of approach shades the environmental drivers of the landscape, which are very site specific and bear the traces of precisely located historical events, even though not always easily recognizable by the planner.

A few weeks after the publication of “Europe 2020”, the Agriculture Committee of the European Parliament set out its strategy for the reform of the CAP in the period 2014–2020. Amongst the document’s recommendations, the most important were to support agricultural practices that work together with the protection of the environment and land. This is absolutely consistent with the ELC, which is the first international treaty to be exclusively concerned with all the dimensions of European landscape. Landscape policies are more comprehensive than environmental policies, and go far beyond the concern for nature depletion and ecosystem functioning (Priore 2006, 2007).

To achieve these important goals, the targets should not be individual farms and their renovation, but territories, individualized as rural landscapes, seen as interacting and interdependent systems. The aim should be, not the renovation but the development of new local systems, characterized by greater social legitimacy, respect for the environment and appreciation for the work of farmers.

Because of the complex and polysemic concept of landscape, it is necessary for the relevant economic, environmental and agricultural strategies of the European Union to be consistent in policies, processes and objectives. There needs to be greater integration of agricultural policies, as well as innovation in providing systems able to support agribusiness and replace those that are not sustainable in the context of family farms. By the effective integration of the agricultural and environmental policies of the European Union, it is possible to foresee the development of rural areas in a way that also protects the landscape, links local actions with global effects and places local people in positions of responsibility. This will be possible only where local plans and programmes are made within the context of higher, strategic-level planning, which takes into account the relevant

frameworks and the constraints in place, including those regarding landscape and cultures. In recent times, the formalization of concepts like “Multifunctional Agriculture”, “Smart Lands” and “High Natural Value Farmlands” goes in this direction (Carta 2014).

4 Protection is not the solution

Ecologists, denouncing the loss of biodiversity as tangible proof of humanity’s impact on the biosphere, find that instituting a growing number of protected areas is the solution for saving significant fragments of what inevitably belongs to the past, meaning a time in which man did not have sufficient knowledge and technologies to reach the remote corners of the planet for purposes of profit (Guarino et al. 2011).

With the single exception of a few “sanctuaries” (Guarino 2013), in the European protected areas the primeval landscape, of which only a few traces remain, is not the main target: there are more references to a traditional world, to a cultural diversity whose way of life and customs are progressively erased by communications, trades and technologies of post-industrial globalization. Today, we refer to that model of development as “sustainable”, meaning that it respects the dynamic natural processes that can assure ecosystem homeostasis and the perpetuation of biodiversity (Guarino and Pignatti 2010).

Unable to leave behind the numerous environmental problems caused by post-industrial man, we tend to idealize a land management that is still connected to the “pre-industrial” tradition, finding in that model the precursor of the envisaged “sustainable development”. This tendency is fed by those who think that marginal areas can live only by tourism and local products, and by others, animated by a general neo-naturalism, who cultivate the impossible dream of the return of a paradisiacal era in which man lived in greater harmony with the natural world. From this point of view, instituting newer protected areas is a sort of incapacity to turn towards post-modernity: it looks like a necessary unconditional surrender to the aggressiveness of the dominant logics of present-day society, oriented towards major profit and fed by the dream of access to luxury goods.

It is not sufficient to fund a multifunctional agriculture to ensure the survival of cultural landscapes, breeds and cultivars, which do not do not attract enough interest in the global market. It is not sufficient to implement Life + and Nature 2000 programs² to the PAC and the Rural Development Plans (RDP), as proposed by the European Commission Strategy for Biodiversity, in the period 2014–2020. Nature, landscape and non-industrialized agriculture must not be “Indian reserves” but have to become a strategic objective, oriented to a different lifestyle that is no longer driven by buying and consuming capacity. In fact, many of our landscapes, including the best and the most exceptional, are the result of a continuous anthropogenic modification: the outcome of the reinvention of places in order to satisfy visions, needs and interests arising from the incessant evolution of human history (Bonelli 1958).

Another important issue for rural development is the promotion of sustainable, multifunctional land-use systems, that need to be planned and carried out in order to be attractive and to provide enough revenues for the young generations (Pe’er et al. 2014). This is necessary because members of the younger generations in the inland areas are less

² LIFE is the EU’s financial instrument supporting environmental, nature conservation and climate action projects throughout the EU; Natura 2000 is an EU-wide network of nature protection areas established under the Directive 92/43.

and less inclined to carry on the traditional landscapes and cultural patterns if they are not sufficiently profitable in terms of costs and benefits (Babai et al. 2015).

Otherwise, whatever the budget, it will not be possible to exit from the present prospect, which shows contributions as an income integration to the marginal area population—a client device that is unable to reduce the fragility of the territory. We need to foster cultural enrichment, encouraging the convergence of knowledge, in order to facilitate awareness and the participative mobilization of society as a whole in protecting and retrieving the values of the landscape heritage.

Consequently, without a shared revision of the present objectives of “growth and development” by the majority of European citizens, the global crisis may lead to a drastic reduction in funding protected areas and landscape by the European Community.

5 Towards a shared and integrated strategy

The complex geography and topology of the Italian peninsula have resulted in differing approaches to agriculture. At the one extreme, areas of land have been ideal for the development of agri-industry, at the other, in areas unsuitable for intensive agriculture, smaller high-natural-value agri-ecosystems have developed. Those territories, mainly hilly or mountainous, are marginal agricultural areas distributed throughout the peninsula (Agnoletti 2011). In particular, they are the places where it is necessary to create effective interaction and integration between the various tasks such as: encouragement of agriculture, economic diversification, development of rural services, the management of natural resources, the enhancement of environmental functions and the promotion of cultural and leisure activities. Although this need is recognized by the relevant stakeholders, this has not led to an integrated approach in these areas.

The increased diversification of socio-economic activities within an agricultural environment brings towards the aforementioned concept of “multifunctional agriculture”, which plays a prominent role in the improving of the Italian landscape (Barbera et al. 2014). Multifunctionality means all the contributions which the agricultural sector can give to overall social and economic welfare and which society acknowledges as deriving from agriculture. Such contributions can either be on the production side, or be on the service provision side. In order for multifunctionality to work in a rural context, whether peri-urban or otherwise, it is crucial that public authorities recognize farming’s contribution to total welfare and that sufficient resources are dedicated to the implementation of these policies so as to give stimulus and support to innovation in agriculture (Cutaia 2010). Such developments will allow the emergence of new models and concepts of well-being unfamiliar to modern man. However, development needs to take place with technological, economic and social capabilities being anchored to a specific region and culture (Guarino et al. 2014a).

Local societies differ in their degree of awareness of the value of their cultural landscape. All the people in a region (not only farmers) have a role to play in increasing understanding of these issues. For instance, products from a rural/landscape district should primarily meet local demand in terms of food and good environmental quality. This need has to be urgently generated, where it does not already exist, if we want to avoid the spread of hypermarkets even in the boundaries of natural parks. Once these issues have been addressed, attention can be given to rural tourism and trade in local products as an

incoming support. It is clear that national strategic planning needs to find new ways to integrate environmental and landscape issues with socio-economic development.

In addition, overcoming the clear separation of roles and responsibilities between governmental organizations is an essential condition for better results. Regional planning must take the environment into account (as is already stated in several regional laws), and it is mandatory to consider environmental factors as an integral part of the planning process and not merely an “impact indicator”. In this context, Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) could be a viable solution since it has been defined by the European Community as “a systematic process for evaluating the environmental consequences of proposed policy, plan or programme initiatives in order to ensure they are fully included and appropriately addressed at the earliest appropriate stage of decision-making on a par with economic and social considerations” (Sadler and Verheem 1996, p 4).

The recently updated Act of Parliament no. 152/2006 establishes national procedures for SEA and contains directions for the process of evaluating regional planning. The new law has also significantly expanded the scope of assessment to include impacts upon cultural heritage, recognized as “cultural property and landscape assets” (part 2, paragraph 4). The inclusion of landscape in the strategic assessment provides an opportunity for the improved integration of agriculture, environment and regional planning. This would also mark a change in the concept of landscape: not just as “protected products”, but as considering the innumerable interactions of the economic, social and cultural forces in a territory. In fact, according to its cultural dimension, the landscape plays a role in containing mankind and will evolve accordingly, to meet the ever-evolving human needs (Harvey 1990).

During an SEA process, the cultural dimension should be evaluated as well: the context should be analysed multidisciplinarily, examining the natural and man-made elements and the evolution of landscape. An understanding of how the landscape has reached its current condition is essential in order to combine conservation and development. Thereafter, the SEA procedure includes participation from stakeholders in accordance with the principles defined in the Aarhus Convention (1998).

The application of the SEA is not without difficulties, in particular the trap of merely formal participation in which the process is nothing more than a “politically attractive slogan” (Musco 2006) needs to be avoided. Only through the development of a genuine consensus with the local population on common objectives, can a fragmented, multi-polar society evolve into an integrated rural network. This in turn will make possible the survival of physical and cultural landscapes, while favouring necessary dynamic innovation and avoiding the marginalization of the local population.

The full integration of the SEA in urban and regional planning processes is one possible way of building a framework in which policies to promote the development, protection and enhancement of the area can be fully integrated (Fidanza 2011). If well executed, the SEA would be able to reach its full potential. The SEA would, as an integral part of the planning process, simultaneously integrate environmental, economic and social factors. From the operational perspective, the SEA provides a method for integration between different authorities in complex environments.

In a society in constant change, the ability of areas to adapt and respond quickly is vital to keep alive a thriving landscape. The “network” model of organization seems to be the only one able to link local processes with the wider national and international economy and support global cooperation (Buchanan 2003). The horizontal layers of the network (those connecting systems at the same level) will be as efficient as the resulting territorial reorganisation of a real and effective participatory process and will support the easy exchange of information, allow cooperation and support interdependence. The vertical connections

of the network will only operate effectively if the results of the territorial reorganisation are part of a multi-scale process and are able to allow local systems to actively participate in national and European-level policies, programmes and actions.

Looking specifically at the Italian situation, an integrated approach would involve the Ministry of the Environment for the SEA, the Ministry of Agriculture overseeing the CAP and the Ministry of Heritage and Cultural Activities having responsibility for the landscape. If the areas of overlap between the executive ministries are not properly managed, it is likely that the innovative value of the SEA procedure will be lost. As a result, the overlapping jurisdiction and inefficiency that has characterized the governance of the Italian landscape in the last 70 years will continue.

6 Beyond the SEA: the Italian programme for inland areas

In the 2014–2020 EU programming, the Italian Department for Development and Economic Cohesion (DDEC; formerly: Department for Development Policy and Cohesion) of the Ministry of Economic Development entered a comprehensive strategy for the revitalization of the inland areas (<http://www.dps.tesoro.it/documentazione/comunicati/2012/Un-progetto-per-le-aree-interne-15-dicembre-roma.pdf>). This is a first attempt to overcome the fragmentation of initiatives and provide an organic framework for the development of the inland areas. This will happen through a structured programme that will interact, from its start-up, with the local subjects, so as to combine and bind development with the territory. The strategy is to achieve three distinct general objectives:

1. Protect the territory and the security of the inhabitants;
2. Promote natural and cultural diversity and polycentrism;
3. Contribute to boosting economic development.

The maintenance of the territory, along with the involvement of local communities, focuses attention on the management of common goods. The debate is still open, and though the strategy for inland areas built up by the DDEC does not face the legal recognition of the common properties as such (see the work of Rodotà's commission), it acknowledges their public utility through the practice of development policies and funding channels (Giapelli et al. 2014).

According to the definition provided by the DDEC, inland areas are “the vast majority of our national territory, which is not flat, is strongly polycentric, and with a widespread decline in the area of cultivated land and often affected by a marked fall or ageing of the population” (p 1). As a matter of fact, the criteria and parameters used for the recognition of inland areas are not unambiguous. As stated in the same DDEC document, “maps and boundaries, subject to alternative hypotheses, are under construction. They will represent phenomena such as: population density; demographic trends; age composition; share of non-residential and/or unused housing stock; distance from existing hospitals and schools; share of agricultural land/woodland/built-up areas, and their trend over time, etc.” (p 10).

The current framework of these areas is still incomplete and fragmentary, though not static. The DDEC strategy poses a fundamental issue related to the contemporary socio-economic framework: to be effective, a development strategy must first answer the question: “where will the demand come from?”. The answer that the inland areas can give to this question is not the only one. The diversification of the answers responds to the different priorities and preferences of the stakeholders in the contemporary society. We are in a phase in which there is a high demand for specificity.

Lancaster's consumer theory (Lancaster 1966) asserted that prosperity leads to diversification and specialization of preferences. When we consume, we want to know where what we consume was produced. In the case of food, there is a growing number of consumers who are particularly attentive, interested in how and where it was produced and, sometimes, in participating in the production process. Seasonal harvests are increasingly becoming social events and entertainment, along with the spreading of "Agriturismo"—a service provided by farmhouses equipped to receive (paying) guests interested in taking part in farm work.

Until quite recently, the way to improve the socio-economic conditions of inland areas was the promotion of local products (some examples are the DOP, DOC, IGP labels³), the supply of economic subsidies to rural receptivity and the promotion of the best practices and organic farming. In this way, after decades of neglect, many inland areas managed to find a way of recovering, presenting themselves as food or wine districts, made up of traditions, landscape values and cultural and architectural heritages. The experiment was not always successful, because it was not always possible to produce at a reasonable cost the much-desired non-commodity outputs. These outputs are not readily marketable, so it is very difficult to find a balance between the quality of the changes made through financial contributions and the profitability of the actions that, thanks to these contributions, was stimulated. Provocatively, one might argue that the experiment has been successful only where it was possible to transform the unthinkable into the thinkable: that is, where the uniqueness of the sites and/or the extraordinary (and therefore outstanding) fame gained by a few valuable products, for which there was a global demand, the economic value of houses and land has risen disproportionately to the resources invested in local marketing (Guarino and Menegoni 2010). In many other cases, places and products that hoped to be "rediscovered" have not been able to convince the global market of their outstanding value, and in spite of considerable public spending, they are doomed to oblivion without attracting private investors.

In order to achieve the important goals of rural development and preservation of ecosystem services, planning must face two different strategies of conservation: one which is based on the "excellences" and aims at the safeguard of landscapes and products of outstanding value, and one which is based on diffused values and aims at the valorisation of the most parts of the Italian territory and their comprehensive quality (Gambino 2008).

As is now widely recognized, the strategic key of rural development is in the amenities it can offer, first of all, to satisfy a local demand for quality of life (Guarino et al. 2014b). The diversification of socio-economic activities related to agriculture should be reconsidered as a tool for the sustainable management of agro-ecosystems, by targeting not only the primary function of producing food, but also a major overhaul of man's relationship with all kinds of "food", in the sense not only nurture of the body, but also of the cultural, intellectual and spiritual inspiration that contribute to human well-being.

Acknowledgments Logistic and financial support provided by Forum Plinianum and by the University of Palermo, through the FFR 2012/2013, is gratefully acknowledged.

³ These labels promote and protect names of quality agricultural products and foods. DOP: Denominazione di Origine Protetta (protected designation of origin); DOC: Denominazione di Origine Controllata (controlled designation of origin); IGP: Indicazione Geografica Protetta (protected geographical indication).

References

- Agnoletti, M. (2011). *Paesaggi rurali storici, per un catalogo nazionale*. Bari: Laterza Editore.
- Agnoletti, M. (2014). Rural landscape, nature conservation and culture: Some notes on research trends and management approaches from a (southern) European perspective. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 126, 66–73.
- Amidon, D. M., Formica, P., & Mercier-Laurent, E. (Eds.). (2005). *Knowledge economics: Principles, practices and policies*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Babai, D., Tóth, A., Szentirmai, I., Biró, M., Máté, A., et al. (2015). Do conservation and agri-environmental regulations effectively support traditional small-scale farming in East-Central European cultural landscapes? *Biodiversity and Conservation*. doi:10.1007/s10531-015-0971-z.
- Barbera, G., Biasi, R., & Marino, D. (2014). *I paesaggi agrari tradizionali: un percorso per la conoscenza*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Bonelli, R. (1958). Cultura e azione politica nella difesa del paesaggio. In: AA. VV.: Difesa e valorizzazione del paesaggio urbano e rurale. Urbanistica Informazioni—INU, Roma (pp. 223–225).
- Buchanan, M. (2003). Nexus. Perché la natura, la società, l'economia, la comunicazione funzionano allo stesso modo. Mondadori, Milano.
- Carta, M. (2014). Smart planning and intelligent cities: A new Cambrian explosion. In E. Riva Sanseverino, et al. (Eds.), *Smart rules for smart cities*. Berlin: Springer.
- Cederna, A. (1983). Quando finisce l'Italia?. *La Repubblica*, Nov. 27th.
- Colantonio Venturelli, R., Galli, A., & Marcheggiani, E. (2009). *Per uno studio sistemico del territorio e del paesaggio*. Roma: Aracne editrice.
- Cutaia, F. (2010). From agricultural to tourist production. In G. Ruggieri & F. Trapani (Eds.), *Conference proceedings—3rd IRT international scientific conference: 419–425*. Palermo: Gulotta.
- European Commission. (2005). The economic costs of non-Lisbon. A survey of the literature on the economic impact of Lisbon-type reforms. SEC, 385. Brussels.
- European Commission. (2010a). Lisbon strategy evaluation document. SEC, 114. Brussels.
- European Commission. (2010b). Europe 2020: a strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. COM 2020. Brussels.
- Fidanza, A. (2011). La VAS: raccordo tra sviluppo e ambiente. *Urbanistica Informazioni - INU, Roma*, 236, 24.
- Gambino, R. (2008). La conservazione del paesaggio nella pianificazione d'area vasta. In: C. Teofili & R. Clarino (Eds.), *Riconquistare il paesaggio. La Convenzione Europea del Paesaggio e la Conservazione della Biodiversità in Italia: 220–231* WWF Italia ONLUS, Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca, Roma.
- Giacopelli, A. L., Guarino, R., & Menegoni, P. (2014). Conservazione del suolo e politiche di sviluppo nella programmazione comunitaria 2014–2020: Le aree interne. *Reticula*, 7, 29–35.
- Guarino, R. (2013). Absolute zapovednost' as an ethical model. *Bulletin of the European Grassland Group*, 21, 33–35.
- Guarino, R., Bazan, G., & Marino, P. (2011). La sindrome delle aree protette. In S. Pignatti (Ed.), *Aree Protette e Ricerca Scientifica: 143–158*. Pisa: ETS.
- Guarino, R., Giacopelli, A. L., La Rosa, M., & Pignatti, S. (2014a). Considerazioni floristiche per un nuovo manifesto del terzo paesaggio. *Boll Acc Euteleti, San Miniato*, 81, 569–578.
- Guarino, R., & Menegoni, P. (2010). Paesaggi marginali e paesaggi mediati. *Ecoscienza*, 3, 32–33.
- Guarino, R., Menegoni, P., Pignatti, S., & Tulumello, S. (2014b) A territorial contradiction. In: R. Gambino, A. Peano (Eds.), *Nature policies and landscape policies, urban and landscape perspectives*. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-05410-0_7
- Guarino, R., & Pignatti, S. (2010). Diversitas and Biodiversity: The roots of a 21st century myth. *Rendiconti Lincei - Scienze Fisiche e Naturali*, 20(4), 351–357.
- Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hesmati, A., & Oh, J. E. (2006). Alternative composite Lisbon development strategy indices: A comparison of EU, USA, Japan and Korea. *The European Journal of Comparative Economics*, 3(2), 133–170.
- Krzywinski, K., O'Connell, M., & Küster, H. (Eds.). (2009). *Cultural landscapes of Europe—Fields of Demeter, haunts of Pan*. Bremen: Aschenbeck Media.
- Küster, H. (2010). *Piccola storia del paesaggio; uomo, mondo, rappresentazione* (trans: D'Alessandro, C.). Roma: Donzelli Editore.
- Lancaster, K. J. (1966). A new approach to consumer theory. *Journal of Political Economy*, 74(2), 132–157.
- Marsch, G. P. (1864). *Man and nature*. New York: C. Scribner.

- McNeely, J. A. (1994). Protected areas for the 21st century: Working to provide benefits to society. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 3(5), 390–405.
- Moreno, D., & Montanari, C. (2008). Il lato oscuro del paesaggio: per una ecologia storica del paesaggio rurale in Italia. In: C. Teofili, & R. Clarino (Eds.), *Riconquistare il paesaggio. La Convenzione Europea del Paesaggio e la Conservazione della Biodiversità in Italia*: 159–175. WWF Italia ONLUS, Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca, Roma.
- Musco, F. (2006). La fatica di partecipare. In F. Indovina (Ed.), *Nuovo lessico urbano* (pp. 139–148). Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Paci, G. (2008). Il progetto di tutela integrata. Cultura, ecologia, architettura: un'ipotesi di gestione del paesaggio di Villa Vigoni. Clua, Ancona.
- Pe'er, G., Dicks, L. V., Visconti, P., Arlettaz, R., Báldi, A., et al. (2014). EU agricultural reform fails on biodiversity. *Science*, 344, 1090–1092.
- Priore, R. (2006). *Convenzione europea del paesaggio. Il testo tradotto e commentato*. Reggio Calabria: IRITI Editore.
- Priore, R. (2007). La Convenzione europea del paesaggio: matrici politico-culturali e itinerari applicativi. In G. F. Cartei (Ed.), *Convenzione europea del paesaggio e governo del territorio*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Rodrigues, M. J. (2003). *European policies for a knowledge economy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Sadler, B., & Verheem, R. (1996). Strategic environmental assessment: Status, challenges and future directions. Report 53. Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, The Netherlands, and the International Study of Effectiveness of Environmental Assessment.
- Sereni, E. (1972). *Storia del paesaggio agrario italiano*. Bari: Laterza.
- Tilford, S., & Whyte, P. (2010). *The Lisbon scorecard X, the road to 2020*. London: Center for European Reform.
- Turri, E. (2000). *La megalopoli padana*. Venezia: Marsilio.
- Wescoat, J. L., Jr. & Johnston, D. M. (eds.) (2008) Political economies of landscape change. *The GeoJournal Library* 89, 1–221.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.