PART ONE

THE LOCAL SETTING

Chapter 2

The Provincial Background

Introduction - Some brief economic profiles

The province of Foggia occupies the most northerly part of the region of Puglia. With a resident population of 680,000 inhabitants and covering an area of some 720,000 hectares, it is both the largest and the least densely populated of the region's five provinces. It is also the most dependent on agriculture. Almost 40% of its income is derived from this source, and the percentage of workers employed in the agricultural sector (55% according to the 1961 census) is significantly higher than either the regional (50%) or the national (29%) average.[1] Geographically Foggia can be divided into three distinct zones: the Sub-Appennino Dauno, the Gargano peninsula and the Tavoliere.

The first of these, the Sub-Appennino Dauno, is an area of inland mountains and rolling hills running down from the western flank of the province, and extending laterally from the watershed of the Apennines to the central Puglian plain. This zone comprises some 26 communes which cover an area of 133,000 hectares and contain about 90,000 inhabitants. The high percentage of communes located here (almost one half of the provincial total) bears witness to its former economic and political importance. Although the Sub-Appennino Dauno has the lowest population density in the province (69 per square km), its economic resources are insufficient to meet the needs of its inhabitants. Land is of poor quality and subject to drought and erosion; agricultural yields are low. These deficiencies have been intensified by a traditional tenurial system which leads to land fragmentation and scattering, and by the practice of a type of mixed farming which is unsuitable for the area. Indeed, the high incidence of emigration, which over the last two decades has led to many hill-top communes being deprived of over one-half of their adult male population, is a strong indication of the economic plight of this zone.

In many respects, the economic structure of the Gargano is similar to that of the Sub-Appennino Dauno. Situated in the north-east corner of the province, with one-quarter of its land surface and one-fifth of its population,

it is dominated by a central mountain range which, except in the north, drops down abruptly to meet the coast. This inland mountainous area is mainly forest and pasture interspersed with cereal cultivation on its lower slopes and valleys. Only along a narrow coastal strip and in the partly irrigated plain of Lesina in the north does this mixture of cereals and sheep give way to intensive fruit (particularly olives and grapes) and vegetable cultivation. The fourteen communes of the Gargano are located on its perimeter, the central uplands being largely denuded of population and settlements. Although emigration is not so great as in the Sub- Appennino Dauno, over the last century it has easily absorbed the natural rate of increase of the population.

Economically, the province of Foggia is dominated by the Tavoliere, a broad and fertile central plain which, running north-to-south down its entire length, occupies more than one- half of its total territory. This area contains some 22 communes with a population of 434,000, and also includes the provincial capital, the city of Foggia, which, with 118,000 inhabitants, is by far the largest of them. Until recently, the Tavoliere was devoted to cereal cultivation, typically produced on large, absentee owned, estates. Even today, hard wheat is by far the most important crop, although, partly as a result of land reform and partly due to the increasing availability of irrigation, there has been a marked growth in fruit and vegetable production in the last few years, particularly in the Fortore basin. This is also the area most affected by recent industrial development schemes. Over the last century the population of the Tavoliere has almost tripled, much of this increase being due to a steady flow of immigrants from other parts of the province.

Recent History and Economic Development

One of the most important features of the recent history of the province of Foggia has been the radical change in the economic structure of the Tavoliere, and the changed relationships between the communes of the central uplands and the plains which followed in its wake.

Until the beginning of the nineteenth century the Tavoliere was directly administered by the *Regia Dogana delle Pecore* (the Royal Sheep Customshouse) which was based in Foggia; and under state tutelage some four-fifths of its area was reserved as pasture for the huge transhument flocks of sheep which moved down from the surrounding mountains, and especially from the Abruzzi, in November, to spend the winter months on the north Puglian plains. This system of land exploitation had important consequences, not only for the economic structure of the province as a whole, but also for its population distribution and settlement pattern. The priority given to sheep severely restricted economic opportunities and output on the plains. There

was little incentive for agricultural improvements, and large tracts of land were infertile, swampy, and ridden with malaria. In areas not given over to sheep, grain was the principal crop, and arable holdings tended to be large, extensively worked, and usually situated on the outskirts of the Tavoliere.[2] The agricultural population permanently resident in the plain was very small (probably no more than 30,000 in the 1870s),[3] and large landowners had to import substantial numbers of temporary workers from nearby provinces in order to meet labour needs at peak seasons, particularly during the grain harvest. For most of the nineteenth century the bulk (some two-thirds) of the province's population lived in the Gargano and the Sub-Appennino Dauno, and settlement areas tended to be concentrated in the foothills which surrounded the Tavoliere, especially along the drovers' paths (*tratture*) along which the sheep made their annual journey from the mountains to the plains.

From the middle of the eighteenth century, the *Regia Dogana* was increasingly attacked by liberal economists who argued that state control was the primary obstacle to Foggia's economic development.[4] In response to this criticism, there was, in fact, a gradual release of sheep reserves for more general agricultural purposes. Thus, in 1789, small portions of the Tavoliere which were unsuitable for sheep were given on long leases to peasant cultivators; and a similar policy, although on a much larger scale, was adopted after 1806 as part of the Jacobin reforms introduced by the Napoleonic regime in Naples. These reforms had three main aims: to encourage peasants to live on the plains, to stimulate agricultural improvements and land conversion, and to facilitate the creation of a class of peasant smallholders. None of them, however, met with any real measure of success. Poor communications and unhealthy working conditions were important deterrents. Peasants living in the countryside were deprived of their social support networks in the towns; mortality rates were far higher on the plains than in hilltop communes. Furthermore, few peasants had either the capital or the marketing skills to take full advantage of the land they had received, most of which passed quite illegally into the hands of local notables to whom they were indebted.

During the course of the nineteenth century, the Tavoliere was gradually converted from pasture to arable. This process began with the reforms of 1789 and 1806, and was greatly encouraged by the abolition of *Regia Dogana* in 1865 and the subsequent sale of crown and demesne lands. It was largely completed in the 1890s when a combination of low wool prices, the introduction of rudimentary mechanisation, and a slight rise in the price of grain gave cereals a decided edge over sheep. Economically, conversion proved a mixed blessing. Faced with rising costs and a shortage of pasture, Abruzzi shepherds found it increasingly difficult to maintain their traditional

pattern of transhumance, and there was a sharp decline in the number of sheep pasturing in the plains. Some of the richer sheep owners sold part of their flocks, bought land on the Tavoliere which came cheaply onto the market after 1865, and gradually became part of the new gentry and professional class which was slowly emerging in the north Puglia towns; others abandoned the Tavoliere altogether, seeking winter pastures in the Rome hinterland, nearer to their traditional market outlets. Although quick profits could be made by sowing grain in newly converted land, the practice of monoculture and the virtual absence of fertiliser led to a rapid fall of yields. Indeed, between 1866 and 1909 there were no less than three major public enquiries into economic conditions in the province (Scelsi, 1866; Jacini, 1884; Faina 1909), and all three commented on the low yields, lack of capital investment, and the general poverty of agriculture.[5]

In the years immediately following unification the population of the Tavoliere remained fairly static. From the late 1870s onwards, however, despite the growth of overseas migration, it steadily increased. Between 1881 and 1911 the number of inhabitants rose by 60%, a rate of growth which was only matched again in the two decades following the Second World War.[6] In large measure this increase was achieved at the expense of the Gargano and the Sub-Appennino Dauno. Although probably the least labour intensive of all arable crops, extensive grain cultivation required a larger work force than sheep, and the introduction of specialised fruit cultivation around San Severo and Cerignola also began to induce peasants to move into the plains. Paradoxically, emigration too contributed to the growth of population on the Tavoliere. As a result of improvements in physical communications, many of its towns became convenient staging posts on the road to the Americas. And for returning migrants they offered greater economic opportunities than mountain and hill-top communes. Indeed the vast increase in the volume of land sales between 1900 and 1920 and the capital and labour invested in smallholdings on the outskirts of plains towns is striking testimony to the success of the first wave of overseas migration.

By the beginning of the twentieth century the main structural elements of north Puglian agriculture, the dominance of the large estate and the extensive cultivation of wheat, had been firmly established, and despite a series of agricultural reforms and development schemes the last seventy years has brought little to dispute their sway. The three most important changes in these years have been the mechanisation of agriculture, land reform and attempts to irrigate and introduce specialised cultivation. But, so far, none of them have fundamentally altered the character of agriculture in the province.

Probably the most dramatic change has been in the field of mechanisation. To a limited extent mechanisation was introduced onto the plains at the end of the last century, and modest progress in this sector continued to be made during the inter-war period. Since the 1950s, however, the use of all types of agricultural machinery has proliferated to the point at which it has led to a substantial reduction in agricultural employment. Thus between 1961 and 1968 the number of motor-drawn implements used in agriculture tripled (5,096 - 16,168), and with labour requirement for cereals now reduced to some six or seven days work per hectare per year the agricultural labour force has diminished to about one-third of its size in the immediate post-war years.[7] The social effects of these changes have been considerable. In the first place, they have led to the virtual disappearance of the large numbers of landless, under-employed, agricultural day labourers who until recently were a typical feature of plains towns, and, who were either absorbed as unskilled labourers into the booming construction industry of the early sixties, or, more usually, have joined the ranks of overseas migrants. Secondly, increasing mechanisation and the systematic use of fertilisers and insecticides which has greatly improved yields has made possible a new form of absenteeism. Many of the owners of medium-sized and large estates are town-based, middle class, professionals. With its low labour requirements and little need for constant supervision, grain is an ideal crop for part-time farmers. And an EEC policy of tariff protection for cereals has both guaranteed them adequate profits and helped to confirm their traditional view that investment in land and property are the surest form of capital saving.

Despite the comparative failure of nineteenth century land resettlement and re-distribution schemes, there have been two further attempts at land reform. Thus, in 1938 some 773 self-contained farms of 30 hectares each (covering a total area of 22,000 hectares) were created, mainly from reclaimed land, and distributed to war veterans. In 1951, a further 56,000 hectares were expropriated from large landowners, and assigned to some 7,000 peasant families.[8] And at the same time, the Land Reform Board embarked on an extensive programme of land amelioration, re-education and the improvement of rural services and infrastructure. Although these reforms served to widen the property owning group, their effects on the structure of agriculture as a whole were limited. The farms set up by the 1938 scheme were similar to existing small grain estates which were already quite common in the province. The much more ambitious aim of the *Ente Riforma* to create small, irrigated, intensively cultivated, family farms has been successful only in a few isolated areas. In many parts of the province holdings have been partially abandoned, being used only for the production of cereals, or

else let to nearby landowners, or even, in coastal areas, having been 'sold' to property speculators for the construction of holiday villas.[9] Indeed, it is probably not too fanciful to suggest that one of the most important unforeseen consequences of the land reform programme has been to strengthen the traditional, grain-based agriculture, the rapid mechanisation of cereal production having been greatly facilitated by improvements in rural services and particularly by the creation of a fairly efficient network of county roads.

A third area of change has been the introduction of specialised crops. This can most easily be seen by comparing the figures for land use and crop distribution in the 1929 and 1961 agricultural censuses.[10] In this period the acreage cultivated with grapes, fruit and vegetables has almost doubled (having risen by 92%), and there has been an even greater increase (125%) in the use of forage crops and sown pastures. In addition, since 1952 there has been a sharp rise in the production of sugarbeet and table grapes and an increasing concentration on dairy and beef production. It is, however, important to note that the acreage given over to specialised crops is still only a small percentage (about 10% in 1961) of the provincial total, and that such cultures are largely restricted to four main areas: the San Severo and Cerignola districts, (the traditional wine growing areas), and to the recently reclaimed and irrigated salt marshes between Manfredonia and Margherita di Savoia, and the plain of Lesina.

Despite this trend towards diversification of crops, the supremacy of cereal cultivation has not been seriously challenged. Interestingly enough, in the same thirty year period the acreage under grain has also increased by 10%, and it now occupies some 53% of the total cultivable land area of the province (51% in 1929).

In comparison with this fairly complex history of agricultural change over the last century, development in the industrial sector has been remarkably straightforward. At the time of unification, Foggia had no industries apart from a few artisan workshops, nor, with one notable exception, was it to acquire any until well after the Second World War. Thus, in the introduction to his description of economic conditions in Foggia in 1866, Scelsi remarked, 'So far, manufacturing industry is virtually unknown here'.[11] And from his subsequent account of the types and distribution of industrial enterprises found in the province's various communes (for example, 2,426 handlooms distributed between 39 communes, and 162 brick and pottery kilns employing 873 workers in 7 communes), it is clear that, with the exception of the state owned salt works at Margherita di Savoia, they were small, artisan based, and catered almost exclusively for local needs.

The next century brought relatively few changes, and most of them were deleterious rather than beneficial in their consequences. Thus, improvements in transport and communications favoured the more vigorous industries of northern Italy which were usually able to undercut their rivals in the South. And the increase in artisan apprenticeships and commercial activities at the turn of the century, brought about by socially mobile emigrants investing their savings in the non-agricultural sectors, led to unemployment and intense competition amongst shopkeepers and artisans rather than a significant expansion of trade and industry. The continuing artisan character of local industry emerges clearly from the 1951 census, according to which 7,884 local firms employed 25,427 workers, an average of 3.34 each. A decade later, this average had only risen to 4.04. Indeed, in 1961, of the province's 460 industrial concerns only one, the State Paper Mills in Foggia, employed more than one thousand workers,[12] eight had between 101 and 250 employees, 135 between 11 and 100, and more than 70% of the total industrial work force belonged to firms with less than ten full-time workers.

Since the early 1960s there has been a modest rise in industrial employment and the gradual introduction of more modern industrial structures. Largely as a result of government industrial development policy a number of national companies have been persuaded to establish factories in the province,[13] and there has also been a rapid expansion of food processing plants, in part set up by outside companies, in part jointly financed by local entrepreneurs and government development funding bodies. In addition, the building boom of the mid-sixties has led to the expansion of many locally based firms operating in this sector. Yet although the city of Foggia and a handful of adjoining communes have derived some benefit from these changes,[14] in the context of the provincial economy as a whole their influence has been limited. Hitherto, the industries brought into the area do not appear to have had the multiplier effects hoped for by national planners, nor has the creation of industrial jobs been on a sufficient scale either to lead to a significant switch of workers from the agricultural to the industrial sector, or to provide a viable alternative source of employment for the province's many migrant labourers.

Current Plans and Policies

Current development plans in the province can be conveniently divided into three sectors: tourism, agriculture and industry, and, in accordance with national planning policy which insists on concentration of investment, several areas have been singled out as poles of development.

So far the only area to be granted the status of a centre for tourism is the Gargano, which received official recognition in 1965. As a direct consequence of this decision, a considerable effort is now being made to improve services in this area, and especially to provide an efficient network of roads and communications which will make this rather isolated zone more accessible both to the provincial capital and to the main Adriatic highway. In addition, government grants and fiscal concessions have been made available for the building of tourist facilities of all types. A number of hotel complexes have already been established, of which by far the largest is a group of hotels and holiday villas created by an ENI subsidiary company at Pugnochiuso, in the centre of the Gargano. Whilst it is too soon to make an accurate assessment of the future prospects of the development of tourism in this area there are already signs that present plans are running into difficulties. The newly created holiday resorts are too dependent on a short seasonal trade, and have found it difficult to make an adequate return on capital. And, although they have been reasonably successful in attracting overseas and northern Italian tourists, their hope of building up a flourishing local tourism, catering for the middle and professional classes from the surrounding region, has, so far, largely failed.[15]

Current agricultural policy is directed towards the stimulation and acceleration of the existing trend towards crop intensification and specialisation and the rationalisation of land use. Thus, on the plains, the *Consorzio Generale di Bonifica* is engaged on an extensive programme of land improvement and irrigation, especially in the Fortore basin, and a wide range of grants are available to landowners willing to improve their holdings. In the mountains and hilly regions the emphasis is on re-afforestation, the encouragement of animal husbandry and the eventual reduction of the acreage under cereal cultivation. Neither of these policies is new, and both, in the short term at least, are subject to the social obstacles to change discussed earlier in this chapter. The extensive cultivation of grain is so closely and conveniently integrated with the existing social system that one suspects that the widespread introduction of irrigation will simply lead to the absurdity of irrigated wheat, a phenomenon now unknown in other parts of the South. And, although both ecologically and economically re-conversion to forest and pasture is the only sensible policy for upland areas, it is a solution unlikely to commend itself to part-time, emigrant, peasant farmers whose tiny arable plots provide a useful additional source of income for the wives and children they leave behind them, the more so because they fear that it will ultimately lead to a reduction in employment prospects.

For the present study, provincial planning policy in the industrial sector is of most immediate concern. The framework of current policy was established by a series of plans drawn up by local consortia between 1960 and 1969 under the terms laid down by Law 634.[16] Initially permission was sought (and granted) to set up a nucleus of industrial development centred on the city of Foggia itself. After 1967, in part, in response to popular pressure for a more energetic development policy, in part as a result of ENI's decision to build a chemical complex on the coast (i.e. outside the designated area), the local authorities applied to extend the existing nucleus of industrial development to cover an area which included most of the towns of the Tavoliere as well as the 'methane' communes in the Sub-Appennino Dauno.[17] Within this area a distinction was made between zones of primary and secondary importance on the grounds that industrial investment was most likely to be successful if it was more heavily concentrated in a group of central Tavoliere communes stretching from Manfredonian in the east to Foggia in the west, and extending northwards as far as Apricena.

The most recent plan drawn up by the *Consorzio per l'Area di Sviluppo Industriale di Foggia* is based on two main premises.[18] First, that local resources, particularly mineral and hydrocarbon deposits, should be exploited and fully processed within the province itself. Secondly, that in accordance with the National Plan, a wide range of industrial jobs, covering as far as possible the full spectrum of types of manufacturing industry, should be created, in order both to reduce local unemployment, and to begin to provide alternative work opportunities for the province's many migrants. The plan recognises that for large scale investment it must rely mainly on state controlled companies which, like the petro-chemical industry, tend to be heavily capital intensive, but nevertheless expresses the hope that in the allocation of national resources it will receive at least its fair share of labour intensive industries.[19] It also mirrors the National Plan in stressing the need for more positive encouragement of small and middle sized firms, especially those connected with the processing of foodstuffs produced in the province.

Foggia's industrial plan displays many of the weaknesses of recent Italian planning as a whole. Although it formally subscribes to an ideology of concentrated investment, in the course of the last few years the area singled out for special treatment has expanded until it now covers some 31 communes and covers almost two-thirds of the provincial territory. Clearly, its chances of persuading outside industry to invest on this scale or the government to pay for a supporting infrastructure are remote, the more so because many other development areas are competing for similar resources.[20] At its worst the plan is little more than an exercise in public relations: a hastily compiled compendium of the unfulfilled electoral

promises of local politicians, a campanalistic plea for a greater share of national resources.

Within the present planning framework such defects are probably inevitable. The provincial consortia have neither the funds nor the personnel to carry out the detailed research on which successful planning depends, nor once they have submitted their recommendations to the relevant national authorities have they any control over the disposition of eventual aid. Furthermore, at the local level, both planners and politicians act on the assumption that development resources continue to be allocated according to traditional political criteria: either in response to vigorous protest, or as a reward for successfully manipulating the national patronage system. It is, then, hardly surprising that the development projects they present to their superiors are little more than a reiteration of traditional demands, re-cast in a modern and politically acceptable planning idiom.

Popular Attitudes to Planning and Change

My aim in this chapter so far has been to describe the main structural changes in Foggian society over the last century, and the way in which in post-war years both local and national planners have responded to them. It now remains to switch my emphasis and to examine the reactions and attitudes of the 'objects' of change to this process of social transformation. One of the difficulties in doing so is that there is no single common pattern of response, attitudes varying according to class position, political affiliation, and even place of residence. But although people often disagree violently about the value of particular development projects and policies, there is a much wider measure of agreement about the need for change, about the forms it should take, and the criteria by which it should be judged.

A good example of the force of popular demand for change is provided by a series of protests and strikes which occurred between 1964 and 1969 in the 'methane' communes of the Sub-Appennino Dauno. By the end of 1963, it had become clear that methane gas had been found in commercially viable quantities and, in the absence of any firm public decision about its utilisation, it was widely feared that it would be piped out of the region and processed elsewhere. In response to this situation, a number of local deputies put parliamentary questions to both the ministers of Industry and Commerce and State Participations asking for assurances that the methane would be processed locally and pressed for the fields to be taken over by state holding companies such as IRI or ENI. Moreover, in the spring of 1964, multi-party local associations were founded in at least three of the communes of the Sub-Appennino Dauno,[21] with the aim of bringing the issue to a wider

public and bringing pressure to bear on both local and national political authorities. Further protest, however, was nipped in the bud by an announcement by *Snia Viscosa* (one of the major exploration companies working in the area) that it intended to build a petro-chemical plant within the province, probably on the coast near Manfredonia, which would ultimately employ some 1,200 workers.

A sequel to these events took place some two years later following the decision of the *Snia Viscosa* management in March 1966 to cancel their project. After protest transmitted through traditional political channels had seemingly failed to produce positive results, the existing associations for the local use of methane (*Comitati per la Utilizzazione del Metano in Loco*) were revitalised, and similar committees sprang up in most of the nearby communes. Despite the leaked announcement in December 1966 by Girotti, the President of ANIC, that his company had decided to build a petro-chemical complex at Manfredonia, the local associations decided to go ahead with a programme of protest and direct action.[22] In February the associations jointly sponsored a protest march to the provincial capital, and in the following month similar demonstrations took place on the site of the *Snia Viscosa* methane wells. The popular support given to these marches surprised both their organisers and Foggia's political elite.[23] It also proved embarrassing to local deputies belonging to the government parties who were fiercely criticised both for past indifference and their failure to take an active part in the current protest movement. Indeed, protest was assuaged only after the government had given detailed confirmation of the ANIC project, and had promised to use its good offices to persuade the directors of *Snia Viscosa* to build a textile factory in one of the 'methane' communes.[24]

A third series of strikes and demonstrations on an even larger scale, occurred in the early summer of 1969, and led to the occupation and picketing of the *Snia Viscosa* site. Once again, the immediate reason for protest was the government's failure to fulfil its promise to establish a textile factory in the area, and direct action was only called off after *Snia Viscosa* technicians had been seen to measure up the site of their future plant, and the government had agreed to a wide range of new industrial and agricultural investments.

The methane demonstrations raise a number of important issues. In the first place, they were by far the largest protest movements the province had seen since the land riots of 1947 and 1948, and, unlike the land riots which were effectively confined to landless labourers, they were able to draw on the support of a wide range of social classes. Secondly, they presented a clear threat to the traditional political system. The spontaneous growth of

large and vigorous protest movements over which, at least initially, they had relatively little control was a source of anxiety to the leaders of all the main parties, especially since one of the campaign's major themes was that the corruption and inefficiency of the traditional patronage system was a major obstacle to the province's economic development. A third point of interest was the strong emphasis on industrialisation as a solution to the region's problems. Except at the end of the 1969 campaign, when the movement was partly taken over by the parties of the left, the demonstrators showed remarkably little interest in agricultural reform. Their basic aim was to compel the state to intervene directly to create a series of industries which would fully utilise the province's methane resources, on the assumption that this was the only acceptable way of alleviating the problem of unemployment and bringing an end to emigration.

It is worth asking why protest was virtually confined to a handful of towns in the Sub-Appennino Dauno. The simple answer is that these were the communes most directly concerned, and certainly most conveniently placed for organising a protracted sit-in. But there were other deeper and sociologically more significant reasons. For the mountain communes involved (Bicceri, Deliceto, Rocchetta S. Antonio and S. Agata) the demonstrations were directed against a growth centre development policy which almost completely excluded them from future resources, and left their inhabitants with no alternative but to emigrate. For towns such as Ascoli Satriano and Candela, situated on the edge of the Tavoliere, support for the methane campaign can best be explained in terms of relative rather than absolute deprivation. Until the turn of this century they were two of the most prosperous towns in the region. Although by Foggian standards neither are poor even today, the last half century has brought a steady erosion of their political and economic position, and in the last decade they have had one of the highest rates of emigration in the province.

The methane demonstrations also had a number of important implications for provincial development policy. In the first place they provided both local and national planners with a strong warning that bureaucratic inefficiency and prevarication would be met with direct political action. Even more important, they gave a clear indication of the planning priorities of the 'objects' of change. Whilst in purely economic terms it is difficult to envisage any development plan for Foggia which does not put a major emphasis on agriculture, in view of the local population's very strongly expressed preference for industrial change, it is doubtful whether, in the short term, any form of agricultural reform will be successful.

Present agricultural policy seeks to persuade peasants to return to the countryside, both by encouraging the production of labour-intensive specialised crops, and by offering them advantageous terms on which to acquire land. In my view, such aims are likely to prove illusory, if only because they are based on an outdated notion of peasant needs and aspirations. Social anthropologists working in southern Italy have almost without exception, commented on the relative low degree of peasant attachment to the land. Traditionally land was valued because of the many social benefits which ownership conferred (high prestige, security against debts and misfortune and so on), but, in comparison with peasant communities in other parts of the world, attitudes towards it were remarkably instrumental. Nowadays, as a result of the expansion of state welfare services, and the general improvement in living standards, land has lost most of its former social functions. For southern Italian peasants as a whole, agricultural labour, especially if it involves residence in the countryside, has no intrinsic moral value, and their models of prestige and success are firmly town oriented. Moreover, as a direct consequence of their experience as overseas migrants, they have come to associate wealth and high living standards with a high level of industrialisation, and their knowledge of their own recent agrarian past makes them understandably sceptical of claims that agricultural development can bring similar levels of prosperity.

Notes to Chapter 2

1. All statistical information in this section is taken from the 1961 census.
2. For reasons of administrative convenience, the *Regia Dogana* preferred to lease arable land in large blocks.
3. Garofalo, 1970; p. 104.
4. For details see Di Cicco, 1964.
5. Thus for example Scelsi claims that average wheat yields in 1865 were 7.68 quintals per hectare, a level of return which hardly met the expenses of cultivation.
6. In 1861 the Tavoliere had some 134,000 inhabitants. By 1871 its numbers had increased by a modest 8,000. Between 1881 and 1911 they rose from 159,000 to 252,000.
7. Garafolo; op.cit., pp.108-9.
8. These figures refer to the area covered by the *Consorzio Generale di Bonfica*, the Provincial Land Improvement Board. This body was first

established in 1933 and some 455,000 hectares, mainly on the plains, are in its jurisdiction. In the province as a whole the Land Reform Board distributed 58,812 hectares to 7,610 peasant families.

9. Letting or selling Land Reform farms was expressly forbidden under the terms of the original land grants. Whilst it is virtually impossible to obtain accurate information about the extent of such practices, my impression is that they are fairly widespread.
10. Garofalo; op.cit., p.107.
11. *'Finora l'industria manufattrice può dirsi qui pressochè ignota'*. Scelsi, op.cit., p.xviii.
12. The State Paper Mills (*La Cartiera del Poligrafico di Stato*) were a pre-war, fascist creation. At their peak they provided employment for some 3,000 workers. In recent years, largely as a result of labour-saving innovations, the work force has dropped to just over 1,000. The extraction industries provided the other main sources of large-scale employment, particularly the bauxite mines in San Giovanni Rotondo and the stone quarries of Apricena.
13. Thus since 1966 ENI has established three factories and promised to participate in a fourth. Other factories have been set up by *Snia Viscosa* and *Ajinomoto-Insud*, a joint Italo-Japanese concern. These plants which are mainly in the chemical and textile sectors tend to be small, employing between 100 and 250 workers.
14. Most new industries have been concentrated in the capital city or in nearby communes.
15. Annual holidays were not, of course, part of the traditional culture of southern villages and towns, and 'recreational' trips outside were rare, and invariably had to be justified on medical or religious grounds (for example visits to health resorts and religious shrines). In recent years, local tourism has increased. In the province of Foggia, however, it mainly takes the form of day excursions, usually to easily accessible beaches to the south of the Gargano. Long and more costly trips still tend to be justified in traditional terms. Thus, an overseas honeymoon has now became an almost indispensible adjunct to a middle class wedding, but, remarkably enough, it often consists of a grand tour of European religious shrines. And although I have no detailed statistical information on the matter, my strong impression is that Gargano's traditional pilgrimage centres, towns such as Montesantangelo and San Giovanni Rotondo which have received very little government aid, still attract more 'tourists' than the new coastal resorts.

16. The nucleus of industrial development was officially recognised in 1962. The territory covered by the nucleus was extended in 1964. The Council of Ministers for the South gave provisional approval for the plan to convert the nucleus into an area in November 1967
17. i.e. those communes in which deposits of methane gas were discovered in the late 1950s and early 1960s.
18. See Garofalo, op.cit.
19. In fact, throughout the period I spent in the area, provincial politicians were lobbying intensively and, as far as I know, unsuccessfully for the establishment of either an aircraft or motor manufacturing plant.
20. By 1968, 12 Areas and 30 Nuclei had submitted industrial development plans.
21. I know of such organisations in the communes of Ascoli Satriano, Candela and Lucera, and they may also have existed elsewhere.
22. The decision to build the petro-chemical complex was announced without the prior knowledge or approval of the Ministry of State Participations (i.e. the ministry responsible for state holding companies) which bitterly rebuked the ENI management for its action. It is impossible to be certain of the reasons for this very timely leak of information. The standard view amongst Foggia's political elite (and in my opinion the most plausible explanation) was that it had been arranged by l'Onorevole Vincenzo Russo, a junior minister and one of the most prominent local DC deputies, in a somewhat vain effort to maintain electoral support for himself and his party. It is important to note that Russo had formerly been one of ENI's senior managers. Although on entering politics he relinquished active duties, he remained a member of the company with an office in its Rome headquarters and with a wide network of contacts and acquaintances at various levels of its hierarchy.
23. According to local press reports between three and five thousand people took part in the march on Foggia, and between five and ten thousand were present at the *Snia Viscosa* site.
24. These assurances were made at several levels. In a press conference held in Foggia on 6th March, Russo confirmed and released details of the ANIC project, and promised to intervene personally with the directors of *Snia Viscosa* in order to persuade them to build a textile factory. At the same time, Girotti wrote personally to the heads of the various local associations explaining his company's good intentions. Similar assurances were sent by the Minister of State Participations to the Prefect.

Chapter 3

Manfredonia: Economic Structure

Resources and Population

Founded in 1256, by King Manfred, on the abandoned site of the ancient city of Siponto, Manfredonia is one of the largest of Foggia's many communes. Covering an area of some 39,000 hectares, it is surpassed in size only by Cerignola and the city of Foggia itself; and with a population now approaching 50,000 inhabitants it is the fourth largest town in the province. It is also the only port of any consequence in north Puglia. Economically dominated by the large estate and extensive cereal cultivation, Manfredonia has many of the characteristics of a typical Tavoliere commune. But both in physical environment and social composition there are significant differences between Manfredonia and its neighbours on the plains, differences which have had marked effects on its economic and political development.

Generally speaking, the topography of southern Italian communes follows a concentric circle pattern. A narrow band of territory immediately surrounding the town is divided into small, intensively cultivated, plots which progressively give way to larger arable estates as one moves away from the central settlement area. This arrangement offers many advantages to peasant cultivators. In a situation in which only a small portion of the population is prepared to live permanently in the countryside, it allows them to farm intensively crops on which they depend for subsistence. It also cushions them from the effects of land fragmentation and scattering. [1] Although most Tavoliere communes conform to this general pattern, Manfredonia does not. The lands immediately adjacent to the urban settlement area are unsuitable for horticulture, and peasant smallholdings tend to be concentrated in a number of rural hamlets scattered throughout the communal territory.

Ecologically, Manfredonia can be divided into three distinct zones. The south-western half of the commune forms part of the Tavoliere proper. These fertile plains lands, however, are separated from the central settlement area by a spur of rocky terrain, the most southerly outcrop of the Gargano mountain range, which, encircling the town to the north and west, and occupying about one-quarter of its total land area, is suitable only as rough

pasture and for the cultivation of the prickly pear. The third zone, the coastal strip running south along the Gulf of Manfredonia also provides a challenge to would-be cultivators. Containing the deltas of three of the province's main rivers, this area traditionally consisted of salt lakes, marshes and malarial swamps. During the last century, considerable efforts have been made to drain and improve these potentially fertile alluvial lands. Except in the extreme south, round the hamlet of Zapponeta, which has become a centre for intensive fruit and vegetable production, this process is still far from complete.

In general terms, population change in Manfredonia closely mirrors that of the Tavoliere as a whole. In the course of little more than a century its inhabitants have increased sixfold (1861, 7,834 inhabitants; 1967, 44,041 inhabitants) and population density has risen from one-half to slightly higher than the provincial average. The factors mainly responsible for this dramatic rise - conversion from a pastoral to a more labour intensive arable economy and a shift of population from mountains to plain - are broadly similar in both cases. Nevertheless, as Table 1 shows, demographically there are striking differences between Manfredonia and its neighbours on the plains.

Table 1: Population Densities (Inhabitants per km sq)

Year	*Manfredonia*	*Plains Communes*	*Province as a whole*
1861	20	37.5	40
1901	30	60	60
1931	47	72	70
1961	100	105	93

Not only did it start off with an exceptionally low population density, but despite a steady rise throughout the nineteenth century (by 1901 it had 11,549 inhabitants), its rate of growth was consistently slower than that of the other Tavoliere plains communes. In marked contrast, since 1951 it has had the fastest rate of growth in the province, its population having increased by 40% in the period 1951-1967.

The reasons for these differences are both varied and complex. Manfredonia's low initial population density can best be attributed to an especially harsh physical environment. Until well into the seventeenth century, it was subject to incursions from the sea; and the presence of salt lakes and marsh flats near the town made it particularly susceptible to malaria and other endemic diseases. A further factor, of great importance in explaining

Manfredonia's relative failure to attract immigrants in the second half of the nineteenth century, was the land situation.[2] Its high percentage of natural pasture and delta swamp retarded the process of land conversion, and the introduction of capitalism into the countryside: a lack of demesne lands suitable for division amongst peasant families meant that it could offer fewer peripheral benefits to potential immigrants than its Tavoliere counterparts.[3] Indeed it is interesting to note that the rapid expansion of Manfredonia had to wait until the late 1930s when medical improvements led to a sharp reduction in the incidence of malaria, and a serious attempt was made to reclaim swamp land to the south of the town.

The main reason for Manfredonia's post-war population boom is that it has acted as a pole of attraction to many immigrants from the economically less developed communes of the Gargano hinterland and especially from Montesantangelo, its nearest neighbour. In the years immediately following the Second World War, large numbers of peasants moved into the town in the hope of finding jobs in agriculture and in the building trade, and many were willing to accept low wages in order to do so.[4]

In recent years, Manfredonia has become, as it were, the first staging-post on the road to France, Germany and Switzerland. Many *montanari* (inhabitants of Montesantengelo and by extension any of the Gargano hill-top communes) attracted by easier communications, better educational facilities, a wider range of social and bureaucratic services and a reputedly better climate have settled their families in Manfredonia, whilst they themselves have gone as temporary migrants to Common Market countries.[5] Paradoxically, then, overseas emigration has not led to a fall off in numbers. Indeed, one of Manfredonia's most striking demographic characteristics over the last thirty years has been the fluidity and turnover of its population. And despite its rapid growth, emigration rates have not been significantly lower than in other Tavoliere communes.

Overall, this turnover of population and influx of immigrants has been of scarce benefit to the town. The presence of a plentiful supply of cheap labour has both worsened labour relations and hindered the development of trade unions, and has also led to a perpetuation of hostility, distrust and *campanilismo* between Manfredonia and Montesantangelo. Moreover, population pressure has put great strain on the social services and amenities offered by the town. In most of the new, mainly immigrant, quarters which have sprung up on the periphery of the town in the last two decades there is a complete or partial lack of social amenities - piped water, sanitary facilities, made-up roads, and a proper system of drainage. Schools are hopelessly overcrowded, and communal and provincial branch offices are under-staffed

and under-financed.[6] Indeed, without hitherto having enjoyed any of the benefits of industrialisation, Manfredonia has already experienced many of the disadvantages classically associated with rapid industrial development in the Mezzogiorno: a rapid rise in the prices of food and housing, the creation of an urban sub-proletariat, the total incapacity of the existing welfare and administrative services to cope with the needs of a vastly increased population.

Land and Landownership

Until the abolition of the *Regia Dogana* in 1865, Manfredonia, like most communes on the Tavoliere, had a pastoral economy dominated by sheep. Some twenty thousand hectares of its territory were under the jurisdiction of the *Dogana*.[7] Most of the estates controlled by the commune itself (by far the next largest landowner) were also natural pasture, and almost two-thirds of privately held lands were put to similar use.[8] Indeed, in 1866, Scelsi reported that almost 80% of the commune was given over to animal husbandry, and found that in marked contrast to other towns on the plains the number of animals, particularly sheep, goats and pigs, had risen sharply over the previous thirty years.[9]

In terms of property distribution, Manfredonia was characterised by the large estate and by the virtual absence of peasant landowners. This is well illustrated by Table 2 which is based on an analysis of entries in the land register (*Vecchio Catasto*) of 1807.

Almost three-quarters of registered land was in the hands of 179 gentry families,[10] many of whom were resident elsewhere; the tiny percentage of land owned by peasants was divided into small plots and for the most part concentrated in the hamlet of Zapponeta, which had been founded under royal protection in the middle of the eighteenth century as an experiment in land improvement and colonization.

Furthermore, Manfredonian peasants appear to have had very few informal property rights. In many parts of the South (including other Tavoliere towns) peasants had traditionally enjoyed a set of common rights (*usi civici*), for example, rights to gather fallen wood in local forests, gleaning rights, the most important of which was the privilege of creating smallholdings on demesne land in return for an annual fee. These rights were confirmed by the land settlement act of 1806, and on several occasions throughout the nineteenth century local authorities were instructed to divide and allocate common lands to peasants. Although gentry dominated councils were

Table 2: Distribution of property, Manfredonia 1807.

Type of owner		No. of owners	Amount of land (in tomoli)	Percentage
Benestanti	Noble	12	3,646	11.6
	Non-noble	155	19,277	61.6
Institutional landowners	State	3	980	3.1
	Church	33	2,471	7.9
	Commune	2	4,130	13.2
Shopkeepers/artisans		43	100	0.3
Peasants		299	713	2.5
Others	25	2		
Total	582	31,319	100	

usually able to evade or manipulate in their own interests such legislation, by the end of the century most communes found themselves with a small privileged sector of peasantry, whose relative prosperity was based on capital investment and improvements to the land grants they had received. In Manfredonia this pattern of development did not take place not so much because peasants were denied their common rights but because the demesnes in the possession of the commune were unsuitable for the creation of smallholdings.[11] Thus, a government enquiry of 1809 reported that only a small proportion of common lands were suitable for distribution. Most of them were a long way from the urban settlement area, subject to floods in winter and too salty and marshy for cultivation. Mezzanella, the only demesne near the town, was rocky and infertile, useful only as winter pasture. In all, existing smallholdings accounted for only about 200 *tomoli*, less than 5% of the communal demesne.[12] After 1861, the greater part of this demesne was distributed to more than 1,000 peasant families. But according to a report drawn up by a visiting government commissioner in 1888, it proved so difficult to cultivate, that almost all were heavily in debt and 218 families had decided to abandon their holdings.[13]

The true beneficiaries of the nineteenth century land settlement acts were local middle class entrepreneurs and Abruzzi sheepowners. Especially after 1861 when both ecclesiastical estates and the lands of the *Dogana* came onto the market, for those with capital to invest, there was a plentiful supply of relatively cheap land. In Manfredonia, land of this sort was mainly bought by outsiders, many of whom administered their estates through

agents, or rented them to local entrepreneurs.[14]

The main effect of the sale of these lands was to reinforce the dominance of the large estates. This is well illustrated by Table 3. According to the agricultural census of 1931 almost three-quarters of Manfredonia's territory was owned by proprietors with more than 100 hectares, and the relatively small number of holdings of less than 5 hectares accounted for only 2% of the total.[15] From the 1880's onwards, there was also a steady conversion from pastural to arable farming. Largely on account of Manfredonia's physical composition, this process was more gradual than in other parts of the Tavoliere, but by the outbreak of the First World War it was virtually complete. Indeed, by 1931, 55% of cultivable land was used for cereal production and permanent pasture had shrunk to about 30%.[16]

Table 3: Land distribution in Manfredonia in 1931 and 1947 (hectares)

Size of properties	Year	No. Of Owners	Extension	%of Total
0-5 h	1931	350	720	2
	1947	1,060	1,185	3
5-50 h	1931	280	5,400	15.5
	1947	300	5,100	13
50-100 h	1931	58	4,216	11
	1947	59	4,226	11
100-500 h	1931	70	15,999	40
	1947	67	14,887	38
more than 500 h	1931	15	13,339	33.5
	1947	17	13,367	35
Total	1931	771	39,559	100
	1947	1,504	38,768	100

Sources: 1931 Agricultural Census and I.N.E.A. 1947

In human terms conversion led to the formation of a large class of landless day labourers. Before mechanisation, the chief characteristic of cereal production was that it required a large labour force for relatively brief periods of the year. This requirement was partly met by importing large numbers of temporary workers during the grain harvest and other busy seasons, but it also necessitated a sizeable indigenous work force, whose members were ill-treated, poorly paid and underemployed, and whose only means of improving their lot was to emigrate in the hope of earning sufficient money to buy lands of their own, or to set up in commerce in the

town. In fact, from 1900 until after the First World War, when the U.S.A. imposed severe restrictions on immigrants, some 200 (about 2% of the population) landless labourers left Manfredonia each year to seek their fortunes abroad.[17]

The inter-war period brought relatively few agricultural changes to Manfredonia. Fascist enthusiasm for self-sufficiency and the encouragement of grain production reinforced cereal cultivation, and a series of land improvement and drainage schemes begun in the 1930s brought extra land under the plough. But for all except the largest landowners economic conditions grew steadily worse. Official discouragement of all forms of emigration blocked the only avenue of mobility open to peasants, and deprived them of a source of income on which they had come to depend to meet life crisis expenditure. Furthermore, as the population rose, competition for jobs became greater, and underemployment and unemployment steadily increased. At its worst, in the years immediately following the Second World War, at least one-quarter of the active population was permanently out of work, and most of the town's 3,000 agricultural day labourers were seriously underemployed.

The main changes which have taken place since the war - land distribution, crop specialisation and mechanisation - are similar to those on the Tavoliere as a whole, which I described in an earlier chapter. A modest degree of land redistribution was achieved in two stages. In the late 1930s the O.N.C. (the Fascist land reform agency) created two rural hamlets, Siponto and Mezzanone in the territory of Manfredonia, and assigned 135 farms of 30 hectares each to war veterans; in 1952 some 4,000 hectares were expropriated from large landowners and distributed to 500 peasant families for the most part landless labourers from Manfredonia and Montesantangelo. Together, these reforms transferred about 20% of territory of the commune from large to small landowners, and as Table 4 indicates established a substantial smallholder class in Manfredonia. Economically, however, their effects were limited. The Reform Board farms in particular proved too small (7.5 hectares) even with irrigation to provide an adequate living for peasant families, or adequate compensation for the hardships of living permanently in the countryside. In fact, more than one-quarter of the original tenants have relinquished their holdings; and many others are worked on a part-time basis by wives and children, the family head having sought work abroad.

Similarly, the introduction of specialised crops has been only partially successful. Since the war, fruit and vegetable production has increased fivefold, and in the last decade there has been a marked rise in the use of forage crops and the introduction of sugar beet. Grain, however, still

occupies rather more than one-half of the total amount of land available for cultivation, closely followed by permanent pasture which takes up another one-third.[18]

Table 4a: Farm types in Manfredonia 1970

Type	No.	Extension
Worked directly by owner	1,546	18,170
Worked with the help of hired labour or with sharecroppers	236	19,082
Other arrangements	4	80
Total	1,786	37,332

Table 4b: Land distribution in Manfredonia 1970

Size of properties (hectares)	No. of owners
0 - 5	575
5 - 10	553
10 - 25	353
25 - 50	170
50 - 100	68
100 - 500	62
More than 500	5
Total	1,786

The most dramatic change has been in the field of mechanisation which, since the war, has revolutionised the organisation of the cereal estates. Through the widespread use of tractors and combined harvesters and the introduction of chemical fertilizers and selective weedkillers, middling and large landowners have not only been able greatly to increase yields, but also to reduce their labour force to a fraction of its former size. The practice of employing outside casual labour at peak seasons has now completely disappeared, and the number of agricultural day labourers resident in the commune has dropped from 3,000 to 1,200 over the last twenty years. Indeed, the advent of mechanisation has led to a thorough re-deployment of

Manfredonia's workforce, most former agricultural workers having been obliged to seek alternative employment either as unskilled workers in the building trade, or, more commonly, as overseas migrants.

Taken overall, agricultural organisation in Manfredonia has remained relatively stable over the last seventy years. Despite the trimming of the largest estates and the emergence of a smallholding class, cereal production on the large, extensively run, estate is still the dominant mode of cultivation, and the introduction of modern farming techniques has, if anything, reinforced its sway. Currently, there are a series of plans for improving and irrigating the belt of alluvial lands to the south of Manfredonia, but, even if they are realised, in the short term at least, it is doubtful whether they will have a dramatic impact on crop distribution. As long as the present Common Market agricultural price structure is maintained, middling and large landowners have little incentive to change. Grain is easy to sell, gives a sure if unspectacular return on capital, and, because it requires relatively little attention for long periods in the year, provides landowners with ample time to engage in other social, political and leisure activities. By contrast, the introduction of new crops involves high capital costs, more active supervision, possible labour problems in a period of increasing labour scarcity and serious marketing risks.[20]

In post-war years working conditions in agriculture have steadily improved. Day labourers are no longer subject to long hours at low pay, and the acts of deference and extra labour services once required of them by their employers have now disappeared, Far from having to compete amongst themselves and with outsiders for work, their numbers have decreased to the point at which landowners now vie for their services, and they have little difficulty in ensuring that labour contracts and tariffs are fully respected. Similarly, the recent provision of roads, primary schools, electricity and water offer some compensation for the deprivation felt by smallholders compelled to live permanently in rural hamlets in the depth of the countryside.

Yet these improvements have probably come too late to persuade the current generation of Manfredonians that agriculture offers a worthwhile future. In recent years, day labourers have shown a marked preference for industrial rather than agricultural employment. Most smallholders whom I met held a highly instrumental set of attitudes towards the lands they owned, and were doubtful about the possible advantages of investing extra capital or labour in them. In their view, agricultural work was hard and unpleasant, and carried low prestige. Although it provided a means of supporting their families, they would have gladly exchanged it for regular industrial employment, and as far as possible they sought to ensure that their children would not be

obliged to follow in their footsteps.

Fishing and Fishermen [21]

Economically, maritime activities come second only to agriculture as a source of income and employment in Manfredonia. With a fleet of between 250 and 300 (mainly small, family owned) boats, fishing provides jobs for about 1,000 persons, and half as many again are employed as dockers or in servicing and processing industries directly connected with the sea. Sociologically, too, the maritime community is of special interest. For although its members enjoy low social status and scant political influence, culturally they constitute a core group, the one relatively stable community in a town characterised by high population turnover and social discontinuity, the main repository of those values and traditions which are uniquely Manfredonian.

Despite a lack of written records or detailed statistical information for the period before 1900, there can be little doubt that until well into the nineteenth century sea communications played a much more vital role in the provincial and local economy than they do today. Before the building of the railways in the 1870s, much of Foggia's grain export trade passed through the port of Manfredonia, and up until the 1920s it was the centre of a coastal shipping network through which the agricultural products of the Gargano were sent to central markets in Foggia. By contrast in the absence of sophisticated preservation techniques, or means of getting fish speedily onto internal markets, the fishing industry was almost exclusively local and subsistence based. Indeed, despite the decline of the port in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, maritime activities probably absorbed almost as high a percentage of Manfredonia's work force as agriculture until well after the turn of the century.[22] In the first decade of the twentieth century, the fishing industry employed between 500 and 600 persons.[23] The vast majority (80%) were engaged in coastal fishing, rarely venturing more than a few miles from the port, and often possessing their own small rowing or sailing boats, whose crew were either members of the immediate family of the owner, or occasionally more distant kin. The rest were employed on a share catch basis (usually 60% - 40% in favour of the owner) by a handful of shipowner entrepreneurs, mainly of fisherman stock, who had financed the building of a rather larger class of sailing vessel (*paranze*) as a speculative investment.

In this period fishing was a seasonal and relatively unspecialised activity. There was an absence of specialisation between the fishing-boats, and the catch depended almost entirely on what kind of fish was available at various seasons of the year within the restricted area of the gulf of Manfredonia. The *seppia* (cuttle fish) season which lasted from mid March to the

end of May was easily the most productive and lucrative period of the year. During these months, the coastline of Manfredonia was (and still is) divided into strips 900 metres long. Each strip was worked by two boats with a combined crew of 12 members, who lived in temporary huts built on the shore, and sold their catches directly on the beach to merchants from the town. June and July were two dead months in which no winds disturbed the calm of the gulf, and many fishermen turned to other activities, for example, taking part in the local grain harvest. From August to November the main catch was *triglia* (red mullet); and, when winter storms allowed, from November to March, anchovies, cod and *cefalo* (grey mullet) were all brought in.

Three aspects of Manfredonia's traditional fishing industry are of special interest. The first is its relative lack of specialisation. The skills required for coastal fishing were relatively few and fairly easily acquired, and outsiders, peasants or landless labourers, could be and quite frequently were recruited into fishing crews, usually through affinal links. Conversely, in the dead months of early summer and during bad weather in winter, fishermen turned their hands to other jobs, in the docks, agriculture and quarrying.[24] The second is concerned with traditional marketing arrangements. Before the building of the fish market in 1935, relationships between fishermen and the local merchants who bought their catches were based on a complex system of reciprocities.[25] Chronic shortages of capital for the repair of boats and nets, prolonged bad weather, accidents at sea and the need to rent a house, drove fishermen into debt. Generally speaking, they were compelled to seek temporary loans from fish merchants which were usually granted provided that they agreed to sell their catches exclusively to their creditors at prices fixed by them. Thus, each fish merchant had a group of family heads and their crews with whom he traded exclusively, and who were dependent on him for loans and other minor services.[26] And since merchants were often of fishermen origin, interdependency was frequently reinforced by ties of kinship or godparenthood.

A third characteristic of the fishing industry in this period was the degree of co-operation between near kin, particularly between brothers. The typical working unit was a father and his unmarried sons, and at successive stages of the domestic cycle father and married sons and married brothers.[27] This pattern of co-operation, which is fairly rare in other sectors of the economy both in Manfredonia and elsewhere in the South, probably came about because of the difficulty of acquiring sufficient capital to endow newly formed households with new boats, and the physical impossibility of dividing old ones.[28] Moreover, it is interesting to note that the norm of fraternal solidarity also found expression in the bitter hostility and feuding which characterised relationships between extended families in the fishing

community.

The years immediately following the Second World War brought two important changes to the fishing industry. First, with the abolition of Fascist restrictions and rationing fishermen began to obtain the full benefits of the market[29] and, with the arrival of an increasing number of outside buyers from the early 1950s onwards, they were finally released from the control which for so long the fishmerchants had exercised over them. Secondly, there was a gradual conversion from sail to motor powered boats, which led to larger catches, and allowed fishermen both to move further afield and to work for much longer periods in the year. Thus, for example, in 1947 10 small motor boats already accounted for almost one-third of the annual catch, and by 1951 this percentage had risen to one-half. The greater flexibility offered by motor power is also demonstrated by the increasingly varied type of fish catches, and a spectacular rise in production in what had formerly been the dead season.[30]

Further impetus to the change from sail to motor power was provided after 1957 by the intervention of the *Cassa per il Mezzogiorno*. Under Law 634 of 1957 the *Cassa* was empowered to grant subsidies to the fishing industry of up to 40% of the cost of new boats and equipment, renovations of old boats, and shore processing enterprises, and in the period 1957-1969 Manfredonia received subsidies to the value of about three milliard lire.[31]

In material terms, *Cassa* funds helped to build two much needed ice plants, and two small fish processing plants in Manfredonia. In addition, they provided extra stimulus to a boat building and renovation boom which had already got under way before 1957. By the beginning of the 1960s sailing vessels had virtually disappeared; and by the end of the decade Manfredonia's newly motorised fleet had grown to the point at which boat owners were experiencing considerable difficulty in finding crews.

Although financially it is just possible that the *Cassa* got value for money, in human terms its policy caused bitterness and resentment. The fishing community complained that the wrong people had received state aid, and certainly it is true that the bulk of the subsidies went towards financing medium-sized motor trawlers, and one or two larger and more sophisticated deep sea vessels which were often owned by people with little or no connection with the sea. Lacking initial capital, and understandably frightened by the prospect of long-term indebtedness, fishermen were reluctant to seek government subsidies, and, although they received some help from the permanent officials of the co-operatives which were being founded in this period, their lack of literary skills and political sophistication made the complex bureaucratic rules and procedures of the *Cassa* seem a formidable

obstacle.[32] Indeed, their experiences in this field led them to accuse the *Cassa* of favouritism and corruption, and to recount a host of stories about bribes paid to local officials, and frauds (for example, passing off second-hand boats as new ones) connived at by the port authorities. Whether these stories are true or false is impossible to judge and sociologically irrelevant; what is important is that they were widely believed to be true not only by fishermen but by other Manfredonians as well, and tended to serve as a model of behaviour in their dealings with *Cassa* officials.[33]

Over the last twenty years, there can be little doubt that the economic position of fishermen has greatly improved. These are the only group of workers in Manfredonia for whom unemployment is no longer a problem and although in recent years some fishermen have emigrated, it is from choice rather than necessity. Similarly, on all classes of boat wage levels compare very favourably with the earnings of other manual workers, and the welfare benefits provided by the government are not conspicuously worse than for other categories. Again, although fishermen are expected to work long hours in a harsh and often dangerous environment, the renewal and modernisation of the fleet had made working conditions more comfortable, and has immeasurably improved pre-war safety standards. Somewhat surprisingly, despite the fact that a much higher percentage of fishermen now work in boats belonging to others, the social organisation of the fishing industry has remained relatively stable, the family owned boat still being the commonest unit of production. In other fields, however, fishermen have been far less immune to change. The motorisation of the fleet has led to specialised boats and diversification of catches, and to an increasing division of labour between members of fishing crews. Furthermore, as the result of the rapid commercial expansion of the market, fishing is no longer either a mainly local or subsistence enterprise. Indeed, taken overall, fishermen have probably experienced the benefits and disadvantages of modernisation more than any other group of workers in Manfredonia.

The extent to which these changes have been brought about by the injection of state subsidies is difficult to assess. Many of them would have occurred anyway, and that the main effect of *Cassa* contributions was probably to hasten and intensify a pre-existing process of change. Certainly, the direct benefits accruing to ordinary working fishermen as a result of its policies were slight. Yet it is interesting to note that this assessment is not shared by the fishermen themselves, according to whom *Cassa* subsidies provided the major impetus for change in the post-war period. Indeed, this conviction has induced in them a remarkably ambiguous set of attitudes towards the state and national economic planning. For whilst continuing to believe that the state is morally alien and corrupt, they have come to rely on it not only

as the provider of welfare benefits and services, but as the main if none too beneficent or scrupulous agent of social and economic change.

Commerce, Industry and the Professions

For most of the period between the unification of Italy and the Second World War, Manfredonia had a fairly straightforward system of stratification. The basic status division was between those who worked with their hands and those who did not. At the top of the social hierarchy was a small group of resident landowners, professionals and public employees, a local gentry elite, who dominated the political and economic life of the town; at the bottom, a mass of peasants and fishermen who constituted between 80% and 90% of the active population. Between them, and much closer in economic position and life styles to the peasants than the gentry, was a small class of shopkeepers and artisans who, for the most part, provided ancillary services for the agricultural and fishing sectors. Although movement between these strata was not impossible, it was certainly comparatively rare.

After 1900, this system slowly began to change in response to a gradual expansion of the industrial, commercial and public sectors of the economy which leading to greater economic specialisation and differentiation, tended to blur existing status divisions and to create new ones. Three changes are of special importance. The first was the marked tendency for returned emigrants to invest their savings in small shops and to apprentice their children to a trade, practices which swelled the ranks of shopkeepers and artisans and which also brought increasing competition for business and a reduction in status differences between peasants and artisans. Secondly, there was a modest rise in industrial employment. Increasing demand for stone and gravel for the building of roads and railways stimulated the growth of Manfredonia's quarrying industry which in the first decade of the twentieth century employed some 100 workers; and, in the same period, a cement works and pasta factory were established in the town. Thirdly, increasing government intervention into local affairs, for example, the provision of educational and welfare facilities, led to a steady rise in the number of public officials, and public work programmes provided occasional employment for unskilled workers.

After the Second World War, these changes gathered further momentum. By 1951, agriculture and fishing provided employment for only 55% of the active population, industry accounted for a further 23%, and the rest was split between artisan enterprise, commerce and the public sector. A decade later, the proportions had changed to 51%, 28% and 21%

respectively.[34] Although no official figures are available for 1970, my guess is that agriculture's share had dropped to about 40%, a corresponding gain having been made in the industrial sector.

This marked rise in industrial employment must, however, be treated with caution. It has not involved any radical change in the social organisation of production, nor can it be taken to imply that increasing numbers of Manfredonians have acquired experience of modern factory conditions and technology, The majority of 'new' industrial workers are, in fact, employed in the building trade which in the boom conditions of the early 1960s expanded rapidly to meet increasing demand for new houses and public buildings. Yet, despite expansion and a need for greater mechanisation and specialisation the building trade has largely retained its traditional character. The small artisan based enterprise still predominates; and most workers are either employed directly or sub-contract for small family firms. Much the same can also be said of other new industrial ventures in Manfredonia. The last decade has seen the establishment of about a dozen small firms, mainly fish and food processing plants, employing between 20 and 50 workers, most of which have received subsidies from the *Cassa*. Almost without exception, these firms are cast in a traditional mould. Workers tend to be recruited on a family or patron-client basis, and relationships between management and employees within the factory are characterised by a marked degree of paternalism. Furthermore, such enterprises are inclined to be unstable and financially precarious, mainly, although not exclusively, because the primary ambition of their owners is to provide adequately for members of their families at various stages of the domestic life cycle rather than to establish long-term profit oriented corporations.

The only exception to this general pattern was provided by the setting up of a medium size, modern chemical plant, for the production of monosodium glutamate in 1966. Although this factory, which is owned by an international Italo-Japanese combine, *Ajinomoto-Insud*, employs only 200 workers, its relatively small size belies its general importance in the evolution of Manfredonian attitudes towards factory technology and industrialisation. Through contacts and negotiations with plant managers, communal and party officials acquired their first direct experience of industrial bureaucracies and although this experience did not lead them, at least in public, to question the logic of industrial development in the South as a whole, they became much more critical of specific projects and cautiously sceptical about their potential developmental role.[35] The *Ajinomoto* management was attacked, particularly by the parties of the left, for its discriminatory recruitment and pay policies, and its failure to pay local taxes; and the fact that the number of workers employed was fewer than originally suggested was also

criticised. Indeed, their experience with the *Ajinomoto* factory furnished both local administrators and the population as a whole with a model of action and expectations which was greatly to influence their future dealings with and assessment of the ENI project.[36]

A second area of change in post-war Manfredonia is in the commercial and service sectors of the economy. Partly in response to the decline of subsistence fishing and agriculture and the growth of a work force no longer connected with primary food production, even more as a result of the cash remittances of emigrants and greater general prosperity, there has been a rapid expansion of consumer spending and a corresponding growth of commercial enterprises serving new wants. The most dramatic rise has been shops selling food, clothes and consumer durables, whose numbers have doubled in the last 20 years. There has also been a significant increase in commercial services such as banking and insurance.

Since the early 1960s a sustained attempt has also been made to promote tourism in the town. Initial efforts were focused on Siponto, a land reform hamlet, on Manfredonia's southern outskirts, which now boasts two hotels and a number of summer villas. More recently bathing establishments have been set up at strategic intervals along the Gulf of Manfredonia, and a medium-sized and by southern standards, luxurious hotel, and a number of restaurants have been built in Manfredonia. Yet although the town now attracts 50,000 summer visitors each year I find it difficult to accept the argument of some of its more sanguine politicians that tourism is potentially a vital resource and a major growth point in the local economy.[37] Most visitors are weekend commuters or day trippers from the provincial capital, and their spending in Manfredonia is limited. Many of the new bathing stations are owned by northern Italians whose profits are taken out of the area. Whilst tourism undoubtedly provides temporary jobs for some Manfredonians, it coincides with the harvest months when unemployment is anyway at a very low level.

A third important growth point in recent years has been the increase in professional activities and the development of the public sector. Since the war, the numbers of professional people engaged in private practice has risen from a handful to more than 200,[38] and there have been even greater increases in the numbers of civil servants of all kinds. Education provides a good example. In the period 1960-1965 the number of elementary schools rose from 19 to 25, *scuole medie* from 2 to 3, and high schools and technical institutes from 2 with 534 pupils to 8 with 1129 pupils. Expansion on this scale required a significant increase in the numbers of teachers who are now the largest single category of workers in the public sector in Manfredonia. It

also created an educational elite which the local economy had no way of absorbing. Thus, between 1951 and 1970 the number of persons with a high school certificate or technical diploma rose from about 600 to 3,000, and those with university degrees from 160 to about 600. It is clear, that very few of them can hope to achieve their ideal of finding a speedy *sistemazione* near home.

One of the most disquieting features of the recent policy of educational expansion is that it has created an 'academic proletariat' whose members are faced with long periods of unemployment and underemployment, and who see no prospect of attaining the rewards and social position which they have been led to expect. Even for those few who succeed in finding jobs, the future looks far less secure than it did to their counterparts a generation ago. With the overcrowding of the professions, increasing competition for government and local authority jobs, and the proliferation of white collar occupations, there has been a re-appraisal and devaluation of the prestige and economic position of social groups such as doctors, lawyers, teachers and civil servants on whom Manfredonian society traditionally conferred high status. One of the ironies of the present situation is that although traders, artisans and even peasants and fishermen have shown a remarkable willingness to invest in the education of their children in an effort to provide them with a prosperous and secure future, the price of success has been to extend the bitter competition and job insecurity which has always characterised the manual and commercial sectors of the economy to the upper reaches of the status hierarchy.

Conclusion

So far in this chapter I have tried to present an account of the main structural characteristics of the Manfredonian economy, and to show how it has changed over the last hundred years. In the post-war era, in particular, two tendencies are clearly marked; the first is the steady rise in the living standards and general prosperity of all segments of society, the second, increasing economic differentiation and the gradual incorporation of the local into the national economy. *Miseria*, once the scourge of most peasants and fishermen and their families,has now almost disappeared; and, although poverty has been by no means eliminated, it is becoming increasingly situationally specific, being confined primarily to the old, and to low-status families either with large numbers of young children, or which have suffered the loss of the main breadwinner. Much the same can also be said of unemployment which now mainly affects young people seeking their first job, and those nearing retirement age. [39] Over the same period, the subsistence sector of the economy has all but vanished, and the introduction of new

industries, and mechanisation and capital investment in old ones has put an increasing premium on specialised economic skills and technical training.

But, despite the undoubted importance of these changes, Manfredonia's economy still retains many traditional elements. This point can best be illustrated by comparing briefly my analysis of it with the accounts of other anthropologists who have studied the economic structure of rural communities in the Italian South. From these studies two general arguments emerge both of which emphasise their relative lack of economic specialisation and differentiation. Thus, in her account of the social structure of an agro-town in Western Sicily, Jane Schneider has pointed out that intense competition for jobs, unemployment and a general scarcity of resources has led to the development or what she describes as an economy of unlikely combinations.[40] In such circumstances men seek to become pluralists, combining together a wide variety of apparently unrelated economic roles and skills in an attempt to spread risk and to secure an adequate living. Economic specialisation is at a discount.

A second, and related argument has been developed by my friend and colleague, John Davis, in his analysis of land tenure in Pisticci, a small town in Basilicata.[41] One of the main themes in this study is that not only are peasant economic strategies closely geared to differing family needs at successive stages of the domestic cycle, but that in each generation family patrimonies must be created anew. On marriage, each newly established household is endowed with minimal resources, usually a house, some cash, and a little land. As children are born and begin to grow up the household head must seek to maximise his earnings. Typically, this will be achieved by taking on extra parcels of land, negotiating new tenurial contracts and by exploiting political contacts in the town to find extra work. Once the first child of the marriage leaves to set up an independent household this bundle of resources so painstakingly accumulated, will gradually be relinquished, and by the time the youngest child gets married, the original, natal, household will be largely denuded of property and economic assets. According to Davis, this cyclical process of acquisition, concentration and dispersal of resources not only conditions and determines peasant economic strategies, but also provides a more general model of economic behaviour in the community as a whole. And, he claims, it is a model which is often incompatible with the economic goals and policies of outside development agencies.[42]

In the absence of an historically significant peasant landowning class, it appears artificial to classify Manfredonia as a peasant economy, but it nevertheless shares many of the attributes of the traditional rural economies described by Schneider and Davis. In the first place, despite a clear trend

towards greater differentiation, economic specialisation in Manfredonia is still more apparent than real, and claims to specialist skills are often little more than pleas for preferential and privileged treatment in a market situation characterised by bitter competition and scarcity. Thus, peasants and fishermen sometimes lay claim to special expertise in tasks which could be equally well performed by most of their companions, and artisans are prone to exaggerate the mysteries of their craft. Indeed, even the higher professions are not immune to such tactics, many doctors and lawyers pretending specialist status (for example; as cardiologists, paediatricians, psychiatrists and so on) on the basis of little more than an expensively equipped office and a brief post-graduate diploma.

Secondly, pluralism and economic combinations seem to be equally prevalent in Manfredonia as they are in Western Sicily. At all social levels, townsmen pride themselves on their adaptability, on their capacity to turn a hand to jobs other than their main economic activity in order to make a living. Traditionally, the most spectacular examples of job pluralism were found amongst fishermen (who, as we have seen, worked the fields in busy seasons and found occasional employment as dockers) and landless labourers (who, in addition to being expected to perform a wide variety of agricultural tasks, were also sometimes part-time fishermen or quarrymen). Nowadays this practice has spread to the public sector and the higher professions, and it is not uncommon to find lawyers, engineers and civil servants, who are also part-time teachers, boat owners, moneylenders or farmers. Interesting enough, it is also prevalent amongst skilled works in Manfredonia's most modern and technologically sophisticated industrial plant.[43]

In itself job pluralism is of no particular sociological interest, it is merely a symptom of the competitiveness and poverty of a certain type of rural economy; the very much more complex combinations of local entrepreneurs (which usually involve some job pluralism are, however, a different matter. In Manfredonia, as in other parts of the South, the art of the entrepreneur typically consists of bringing together diverse economic activities in such a way that the outputs of one set of activities provide the inputs of another. The entrepreneur is not so much an economic specialist as an expert in social relations, and he maximises profits by the careful manipulation of the various social networks of which he is the central point, and between which he mediates, rather than by concentrating exclusively on any one field of economic activity.

A third characteristic, the tendency for local enterprises to be geared to family needs at different stages of the domestic cycle, is equally common, and together with the relatively low prestige conferred on people engaged in

commercial activities, probably explains why such enterprises tend to be unstable and comparatively short-lived.[44]

Finally, in Manfredonia, as in all traditional agrarian societies, it is difficult to draw firm lines of demarcation between social, economic and political affairs. Relationships are multi-stranded, and social evaluation is never compartmentalised but based on a complex assessment of a person's total performance in his many social roles. Thus, the good husband must make adequate provision for his family, and the success of lawyers, doctors or merchants is judged as much by the skill with which they carry out their domestic duties as by their professional competence. There is a similar overlap between economic and political activities. In order to gain protection, clients or simply a share of the spoils of office, many professionals and businessmen take an active part in politics, a strategy which reinforces the widespread Manfredonian belief that economic self interest is the mainspring of all political activity. This pattern of economic behaviour and values has undoubtedly influenced the way in which Manfredonians have responded to opportunities made available to them by outside development agencies, Thus, in evaluating recent industrial development projects, they have persistently undervalued the importance of economic specialisation, and have been reluctant to concede that the industrial decision making process has a high technological content. [45] Similarly, although there has been no shortage of local entrepreneurs willing to avail themselves of the subsidies and fiscal concessions provided by the *Cassa per il Mezzogiorno*, the use to which they have been put has often been at variance with the basic *Cassa* aim of concentration of investment and the creation of self-sustaining, long-term, small industrial and artisan enterprises. But to see in this response a serious obstacle to economic growth would be mistaken, Shortcomings in the development process in Manfredonia in post-war years can be far more convincingly attributed to planning failures at the provincial and national level. The effects of idiosyncratic economic behaviour in the local community have been, at most, marginal.

Notes to Chapter 3

1. Agricultural economists and sociologists alike have emphasised the economic evils of land fragmentation, which they have tended to explain as a consequence of the system of partible inheritance. In my view, this argument is exaggerated. In the case in point, the fact that peasants own a number of tiny plots on the outskirts of the town does

not seriously affect economic efficiency or opportunities. Such plots tend to be dowry lands worked by women in their spare time.

2. Although the rapid rise of population in the Tavoliere towns in the latter part of this nineteenth century can in part be explained in terms of natural increase, immigration from the mountain areas and from outside the province accounts for most of it.
3. For further details, see above, p.37.
4. There are two main reasons why immigrants were prepared to accept lower wages than Manfredonians. First, their expectations were lower. Secondly, and more important, their market position was different. Unlike most Manfredonia peasants, immigrants from the Gargano hinterland often owned plots of land, even though they were usually too small to support their families. Consequently they were not so much interested in finding alternative full-time employment as in a means of increasing their incomes. In fact, many immigrants from Montesantangelo continued to cultivate their plots whilst working in Manfredonia.
5. According to calculations based on the 1970 electoral roll, Manfredonia has some 2,500 temporary emigrants of whom rather more than two-thirds originally came from Montesantangelo or one of the towns of the Gargano interior. It is virtually impossible to establish what percentage of the current population of Manfredonia originated in Montesantangelo. Manfredonians usually put it at about one-third, but include in their estimate the children born in Manfredonia to first and even second generation immigrants.
6. For example, the *organico* (establishment) of the commune of Manfredonia has remained more or less unchanged since 1948.
7. Magno, 1973, p.15
8. This calculation, which is only approximate, is based on an analysis of the land register of 1807.
9. Scelsi; op cit. According to Scelsi, in 1866, cultivable land in Manfredonia was divided in the following way: cereals, 6,993 h; pasture, 28,217 h; vineyards, 613 h; gardens, 27 h; olive plantations, 242 h; total, 36,098 hectares. Although Scelsi did not disapprove of land conversion as such, one of the main themes of his report was that as a result of the activities of land speculators, anxious to make a quick profit from conversion, animal husbandry had suffered unduly. These strictures do not appear to apply to Manfredonia where, according to his own figures, between 1836 and 1866 the number of sheep, goats and pigs rose from

18,020 to 22,800.

10. In fact, property ownership was even more concentrated than is suggested by Table 2. Of the 179 gentry families, 5 owned more than 1,000 *tomoli*, 17 more than 300 *tomoli*, and 34 between 100 and 300 *tomoli*: and as far as I can tell from the land register most of these large landowning families were outsiders. By contrast many of the remaining 103 gentry families (those with less than 100 *tomoli*) appear to have belonged to a professional class (lawyers, doctors, priests, etc.) permanently resident in Manfredonia.
11. It is also interesting to note that Manfredonians do not appear to have derived such advantage from minor *usi civici*. There were virtually no forests from which they could gather wood, and in the face of opposition from large landowners they were unable to enforce gleaning rights. In other communes of the Tavoliere gleaning during the grain harvest was a very important source of income for peasant families.
12. A.S.F. *Atti Demaniali Fasc*, 19, No. 4. f. 43
13. Magno; op.cit. pp. 16-18.
14. According to the royal commissioners report of 1888, Manfredonia had 519 rural properties, three-quarters of which were owned by people living in the Abruzzi, who rarely, if ever, visited their estates. Magno; op.cit. p.16. This practice of absenteeism continued until well after the Second World War. Thus, an analysis of land confiscated by the Land Reform Board in 1952 shows that more than one-half of the town's largest landowners were outsiders, concentrated mainly in the Abruzzi, Naples and the city of Foggia.
15. Unfortunately, there is no detailed statistical information available for land distribution in the second half of the nineteenth century. There is, however, no reason to believe that there were any conspicuous changes between the 1880s and the 1930s.
16. Sources: 1931 Agricultural Census and I.N.E.A. 1947.
17. Of the 35,414 hectares classified as cultivable lands by the 1931 census 19,722 were devoted to cereal production, 12,591 permanent pasture, 806 fruit and vegetables and 2,295 were uncultivated. Despite a reduction of 60% since 1867 in the quantity of land under permanent pasture, animal husbandry appears to have increased substantially. According to the animal census of 1930 Manfredonia had some 53,000 sheep, pigs and goats, more than double the 1867 figure.
18. The best source on emigration for this period are the reports of the local commissioners acting for the Parliamentary Enquiry into the conditions

of peasants in the southern provinces, (*Atti della commissione parlamentare per l'inchiesta sulle condizioni dei contadini nelle province meridionale e nella Sicilia, 1907-1911*) According to these reports some 4,500 outside workers were brought to Manfredonia for the grain harvest of 1905. Between 1902 and 1907 1,234 Manfredonians (for the most part landless labourers) went abroad. Successful emigrants who returned to Manfredonia usually sought to buy a small property. The commissioners, however, stress that although this led to an increase in land prices, its effects on the overall distribution of property were slight.

19. According to the agricultural census of 1961 cultivable land was divided in the following way: cereals, 18,235; pasture, 11,976; fruit and vegetables, 3,877; forage crops, 2,101; forest, 1,571; Total 37,760 hectares. The figures do not reflect the recent increase in the cultivation of sugar beet which only got under way in the early 1960s.
20. Landowners in Manfredonia usually stressed the difficulties of selling new crops. An example they often quoted was sugar beet. In the late 1950s both large and small landowners were encouraged to plant beet. Despite a good harvest they were able to obtain only low prices for their crops since a sugar refinery which was being built with government aid was not completed on time.
21. I am particularly indebted to my research assistant, David Moss, for the ideas, information and analysis in this section, most of which is based on his own independent research.
22. The decline of the port, which was largely brought about by competition from the railways, lasted until after the Second World War when the opening up of bauxite deposits in San Giovanni Rotondo gave it a new lease of life.
23. De Pieri; 1909, p.113, and also Magno; op.cit., p 56. By the 1920s Manfredonia's fishing industry appears to have increased in size. Thus, in his analysis of the fishing industry in Puglia, La Sorsa claims that in 1927 Manfredonia had about 1,000 fishermen, and a fleet of some 80 fishing boats. La Sorsa; 1934.
24. Taking part in the grain harvest was by far the most important of these extra-maritime activities. Fishermen were usually either recruited by peasant affines, or else sought employment directly from the administrators of large estates to which they tended to return year after year. This practice continued until about 1950.
25. The establishment of the fish market gradually brought to an end the traditional economic interdependency between fishermen and

merchants. It did not, however, do so immediately. Fascist price controls led many fishermen to attempt to sell their catches outside the market, and the old marketing system lingered on in an emasculated form until after the Second World War.

26. Thus, for example, one fairly prosperous fish merchant had ten boats and crews working for him in this period.

27. This pattern of co-operation has continued up until the present day, although most fishermen are agreed that it is weaker now than in the past. Thus, in an analysis, carried out in 1970, of 116 boat owners belonging to three co-operatives for medium and small fishing vessels, 35% consisted of married brothers, 32% were father-son teams, 4% used affines or cousins as crew, the remaining 28% employed outsiders.

28. Extended families are rare in southern Italy. Amongst peasant smallholders the norm is that independent households are formed on marriage, sometimes, though by no means always, endowed with property coming from the families of the spouses. Cooperation between independent households is limited. Where it occurs it is more commonly between brothers-in-law than brothers.

29. Under market regulations fishermen were compelled to bring their catches to the market, where they were sold by auction under the supervision of a public official. This system effectively eliminated the practice of prior price fixing.

30. Before the war, *seppia* had been by far the most important catch; after 1947 it gradually gave way to other types of fish. Thus, the cod catch went up from 11,719 kg. in 1946, to 65,362 kg. in 1950, and 77,160 kg. in 1958. Similar rises can be shown for mullet, mackerel and anchovies. The rise in production in the dead months can be dramatically illustrated by comparing the value of average daily takings in 1947 and 1950. On June 1947 these were estimated at 35,925 Lire; in June 1950, at 227,630 Lire.

31. This figure is a very rough estimate since detailed accounts of *Cassa* spending in Manfredonia alone are not available. In the period 1957-69 the province of Foggia as a whole received fishing subsidies of 4.8 milliard lire, since Manfredonia is by far the largest port in the province, my guess is that it received between one-half and two-thirds of this sum.

32. Fishermen co-operatives are in no sense producer cooperatives. Their main function is to help members by providing bureaucratic services and assistance, and in this respect they play a role not unlike that of the trade unions for other categories of manual workers.

33. Fishermen, however, had a somewhat different model of *Cassa* 'corruption' than that of higher socio-economic categories. In all their stories fishermen stressed the need to bribe minor officials and intermediaries. Middle class Manfredonians had a much more politically oriented model, emphasising the necessity for a wide range of political contacts and recommendations.
34. *Camera di Commercio di Foggia*, 1968: p.60.
35. Thus, for example, in discussing and appraising the problems of industrialisation, there was a marked difference in attitudes and levels of sophistication between politicians in Manfredonia and their counterparts in the communes of the Sub-Appenino Dauno. Both tended to regard industrialisation as the most valid remedy for the area's problems. Politicians from the Sub-Appenino, however, were inclined to see it as a general panacea, whereas Manfredonians were much more interested in discussing which types of industry were best suited to the needs of the local economy.
36. Thus, for example, in 1969, there was a strong rumour in Manfredonia that the secretary of the local D.C. party was about to be appointed personnel officer at the ANIC plant. People who held this view invariably pointed out that a vice-secretary of the same party had been given a similar job at the *Ajinomoto* factory.
37. This argument featured prominently in the controversy over the siting of the ANIC plant, which, it was claimed, would destroy Manfredonia's tourist potential.
38. According to the *Annuario della Provincia di Foggia* for 1969-70, these included, 53 doctors and medical specialists, 40 lawyers, 21 land surveyors, 20 civil engineers, 11 chemists and 4 public notaries.
39. A useful indication of poverty levels is the number of people included in the social assistance (E.C.A.) registers. In 1965, the most recent year for which I have figures, some 897 persons were listed in the Manfredonia register. It is interesting to note that the neighbouring town of Montesantangelo, with only half its population, had 3,263 persons on its register. In December 1968, Manfredonia had 1,200 people registered as unemployed. This figure, however, does not include those seeking their first job, and is largely confined to manual workers.
40. Schneider, J., 1969.
41. Davis, J., op.cit.
42. Thus, for example, the rule that land grants could not be alienated for a period of 30 years was a sensible legal safeguard for the Land Reform

Boards which insisted upon it. It was, however, a considerable nuisance for peasant household heads who needed land to endow their children's marriages.

43. A high percentage of workers at the *Ajinomoto-Insud* factory were also engaged in secondary activities.

44. Generally speaking merchants and businessmen prefer to place their children in the much more prestigious professions or in public service, rather than continue the family business. Thus, enterprises tend to wind up on the death of the founder, or continue in a minor key, as a secondary activity of one or more of his children.

45. See chapter 5 below.