Analele Universităţii din Oradea, Seria Geografie, Tom XVIII, 2008, pag. 27-40

PLANNING FOR PROTECTED AREAS: A MODEL OF PROTECTION FOR THE LANDSCAPE

Giacomo CAVUTA[1]

Abstract: ***The planning of protected areas as a model for the protection of the landscape.*** Planning for protected areas, especially for parks which are areas of nature conservancy, has specific features due to the fact that the areas in question, though very different among themselves, always carry some form of official protection owing to the special value of their natural resources, ecosystems and landscapes. It is precisely this value, making them potential testing laboratories for developing both appropriate relationships between man and the natural world and different forms of sustainable development, that confers a growing interest on the planning associated with them, especially in Europe. This interest has recently been increased by some important factors, such as the rapid spread of protected areas even within mainly urbanized landscapes, the ever more frequent recourse to planning as a tool for managing these areas, and the problems, conflicts and tensions which arise from this, both within these areas and close by, and take on a paradigmatic character with regard to a wider territory. Such circumstances must therefore be taken into account in order to understand the importance that this form of planning is taking on in the wider context of management of a territory.

Key-words: planning, landscape, protected areas.

From many years up to now the debates about landscape protection have been presented initially in a disorderly way as it always happens when a problem, neglected by men of culture and by public opinion for a long time, suddenly becomes real, then it acquires a more rational and scientific form. From the middle of the eighties, in Italy, there is a law that allows us to achieve quite a lot to defend nature and landscapes. However, to find rational solutions is not that easy, not only for the well known obstacles which usually come to clash any initiative for the protection of nature, such as the slowness of the government organisms, the lack of financial resources, the hostility of the local populations oriented to accept the "modern" to make earnings, but also for other reasons. In the specific case also the researchers' discordant opinion about what has to be intended for landscape (Barbieri, 1971). More than few uncertainties remained until a few years ago about this concept, not so much so among the geographers and the naturalists, but surely between political men and administrators responsible of environmental politics. It doesn't surprise, therefore, that such uncertainties also reflected on the legislative as well as on the operational level. Today, however, there is no doubt on the fact that the landscape represents a defined spatial unity, whose individuality draws origin from the sedimentation of nature actions and from human activities. In the definition of landscape are included "non only the natural beauties or those introduced in the territory thanks to the work of man, neither nature alone, but the form of the territory or the environment, created by the human community that has settled in the territory through a continuous interaction of nature and man. The landscape, in a natural environment modified by the man, is the expression of a dynamics of natural forces, but above all, of man's strengths and, therefore, of social

[1] Universita „G. D'Annunzio" Dipartimento di Economia e Storia del Territorio, Viale Pindaro 42 65127 Pescara, Italy, e-mail: cavuta@dest.unich.it

strengths conditioned by the geographical environment and by the climate, however that don't passively accept constraints but operate against them, or they are even particularly stimulated by them" (Predieri, 1981, p. 503). Therefore the landscape presupposes the presence of man, who becomes fully aware of the particular qualities of his environment, different from those of other places, and he starts a relation with it through a gradual process that is not only cognitive but it is also an affective choice.

The conservation of the landscape loses, in this way, the conservative and static character and it becomes a managerial and dynamic activity, entirely directed into the sector of territorial planning. This latter will have to be conditioned by the cultural value of the landscape, with the pledge not to modify it. It remains to say that a global planning of the territory can be realized only after profound preliminary studies, necessary for both the goals of a complete recognition of what exists, and a correct evaluation of human activities: of those in action and of those susceptible to the development within compatible limits. Such objective can be reached only with the contribution of higher professional figures, of different cultural extraction, who gradually move toward an integrated type approach (Pinna S., 1996).

This demand of integration appears evident exactly by analyzing territorial politics. The characteristic that unites these politics is to place the territory at the center of their action: it is not just meant to promote protection politics of a single resource but to lay down politics of protection and inter-sectorial management toward specific territorial areas as in the case of a park, or to the whole territory, as in the case of territorial and landscape planning. Such politics cannot a have mere defensive character but, on the contrary, they require a strong planning tension, to remove the structural reasons for the degradation and to pursue new equilibriums between social and environmental process. The social question for the defense and the retraining of the environment is intended, in this way, in a question of planning (Gambino, 1994).

The planning of protected areas, particularly concerning natural parks, essentially owes its specificity to the fact that the interested ambits, even in their differences, are always characterized by some form of institutional protection for the particular value of the natural resources, of the ecosystems and of the hosted landscapes. It is really this particular value that makes them potential experimentation laboratories of acceptable connections with the natural world and of sustainable forms of development, conferring an increasing interest to the planning concerning them, especially in Europe. This interest is today also emphasized by some meaningful circumstances such as the rapid diffusion of protected areas even inside predominantly urbanized territories, the more and more frequent utilization of planning as a tool to manage it; the emerging, in their internal or in their proximity, of problems, conflicts and tensions that assume a paradigmatic character towards the rest of the territory. Therefore, it is in relation to such circumstances that must be caught the meaning that this form of planning is assuming towards the more general process of territory government.

In the attempt to answer to the solicitations deriving from environmental matter, the planning culture has followed other ways from the traditional ones, it has opened new grounds of research and it has proposed new management tools. Two principal tendencies have been asserted: from one side, the specialization of approaches and tools, that has generated, especially in Italy, a confused and uncoordinated proliferation of planning tool; on the other hand, the environmental protection integrated within the instruments for territorial general planning. In relation to these tendencies, the development of parks and natural spaces planning have assumed, in Italy and generally in Europe, increasing importance, not only for the progressive expansion of the application field, but also for the particularly incisive role that this particular planning form is juridically as well as

institutionally, recognized.

Parks as essential instruments for nature conservation

The first episodes of public protection of nature have sprung, around the middle of the 18th century, from aesthetical concerns, from a still romantic conception of the landscape as it has been, exactly, the creation of the Fontainebleau forest, followed, a few years later, by the reserve of Creux-du-Van. Although today these types of motivations don't prevail anymore, it is opportune to notice that the concern for nature preservation, even with contemplative intents, sprang out from the desire to oppose urban expansion as well as deleterious consequences of the spreading industrialization. In any case, the meaning of preserved area was now born and, from it, important fruits had to come.

In March 1872, in the United States, through an Institutional Act, was enacted the national park of Yellowstone. An Act that sets the base on the history of the national parks and it still represents today a fundamental reference. Around eighteen hundred hectares of the Wyoming and Montana have been devoted to "public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people" they have constituted then, as well as in our days, an event whose importance can be comprehended only if we ideally place ourselves in that historical time which was extraordinarily innovative.

The example of the United States after Yellowstone continued with the park of Mackinac Island in 1875 and, then, with the parks of Redwood, Yosemite, General Grant in 1890. Two elements characterize the American conception of national parks, and today to a large extent, are preserved the criterion of "scenic and panoramic value" and the tourist-recreational use, that is to say the maximum opening toward a controlled and respectful popular fruition. Timely other Countries imitated. Australia created, in 1886, the park of Illawara in New South Wales that, in 1955, becomes the real national park. New Zealand, in 1894, founded the national park of Tongariro. South Africa instituted, in 1898, the Sabie fauna reserve and in 1926 it instituted the Kruger national park.

The American example, therefore, as it still happens for the environmental politics, works as stimulating paradigm for Europe and the world. Our continent needed a few years to metabolize the concept of park in the ample and modern meaning that the United States had furnished. However, the politics of the protected areas became incisive from the beginning of the 19th century also in European Countries. In 1902 the first international conference was held in Paris, for the safeguard of the fauna in the world, in that occasion the activity of the parks started to be taken into consideration. In 1909, upon initiative of Sweden, two bordering parks came to light in Lapland. Still in 1909 the Luneburger Heide park was instituted in Germany, in 1913 the Pelvoux in France, in 1914 the Engadina in Switzerland, in the 1919 Bialowieza in Poland and so on.

In Italy, after almost half century from Yellowstone, finally the first national parks were instituted. in 1922 the parks of Gran Paradiso and of Abruzzo. In 1934 the park of the Circeo was added and, the following year, that of the Stelvio. Then it was necessary to wait until 1968 for a new park, that of Calabria. In 1988 were added, to the five existing parks in our Country, the national parks of the Pollino, of the Bellunesi Dolomiteses and of the Sibillini, in accordance with the Law n. 67. The following year the Law n. 305 (the triennial program for environment preservation) institutes the national parks of the Tuscany's Archipelago, of the Forests Casentinesi and of the Aspromonte. The Law n. 394/91, on protected areas, allows the birth of the national parks of the Cilento and Vallo di Diano, of the Gargano, of the Gran Sasso - Laga Mountains, of the Maiella, of the Gennargentu and Golfo of Orosei, of the Val Grande and of the Vesuvius. Finally the Law (Legge Quadro) n. 10 of 1994 institutes the national park of the Maddalena. With the full implementation the Law of 1991, the percentage of protected land in Italy reaches 10% of the national territory,

or more than twice as much compared to the protected land in 1988, year in which it amounted just to 4,3%.

Too many people think that a park is, above all, a geographical space, a surface expressed in hectares and, as such, to be delimited with precise borders, with things that happen inside and things that happen outside, naturally different among themselves. Ordinarily it is retained, and justly, that inside "that" space the conservation of the nature should manifest as well as that of the landscape, with the peculiar characters and existent diversities. Only few people, instead, think that a park cannot be only a geographical area and that talking about its preservation without defining who manages the conservation, with what kind of benefits and with what means, including knowledge and technique, is only another auspice of events that escapes the logic and the necessary adherence to history.

In 1933, in London, in the occasion of the international conference on fauna and flora protection problems, the definition of park was coined, meliorated during the successive decades but equally meaningful: "a national park is an area submitted to public control, destined to protection and preservation for the profit of public recreation; it is the place of prohibitions: no hunting, no collection or killing of fauna, no destruction or collection of the flora" (Daclon, p. 17). One of the purposes of the lecture was to universally reach an acceptable definition of a park; even though such result has not been achieved, still some important facts have emerged from that conference: the principle of public control, the principle of educational finality, even if understood in an extremely generic sense, and so on.

Contrarily to what it can be thought, it is not easy to establish what we have to intend for a park; in fact if we examine the definitions proposed, till now, from single authors or from various international associations, we find ourselves in front of so many ideas about the nature and on the parks' ends. All the conceptions are, at times, valid and defective, or good and lacking or difficult to apply because based on particular experiences. There is then, to add, that in the various scientific conferences held till now, some definitions of a park have been proposed which, then, one after the other, have been, superseded and abandoned. However, this follow up of proposals and criticisms must not be considered entirely as a negative fact; rather "are instead to be praised the completed attempts to reach a conception of basic universal value that includes all the ideas of park and protected area instituted by local situations, till now. Besides it is true that single countries governments, in founding parks having as base its own local customs and its own conception about preservation, offer to the international attention models of experiences that deserve meritorious consideration, at least as cultural contribution" (Pinna M., 1996, p. 294).

Surely the park is the house and the activity of someone to whom is owed, above all, the preservation of that environment, of peculiar characters, of those differences. A worked space, therefore, cultivated, managed, and in some cases even projected. Preservation, then, means something more than a form, a rule and a law; it means to replace an intervention that doesn't have, anymore, an economic meaning in the present society, with another that has it and that is compatible with the environment; it means continuous planning of the ecosystems keeping in mind new and not always legitimate requests that from far away direct themselves toward the most remote and natural areas, for the need of knowledge, of environmental and cultural values, of curiosity and of actuality. The parks have too often been seen, for ingenuous or captious interpretations like as the barrier of activities and the apposition of self imposed restrictions, without any type of economic incentive. In our Country, culturally speaking, the positive part of park promotion is still to be created and discovered.

A park, besides the necessary ties and prohibitions, represents in the modern

conception a series of opportunities of social and economic development already brightly experimented in various European regions. Examples of compatible activity stimulated with economic supports are the creation of villages having horizontal structure, in depopulated agglomerates, with agro-tourist organizations type and services managed by local people; revitalization of historical centers targeted to tourism, with public infrastructures common to the local population and to the external guests; institution of a double equipped camping network in proximity of inhabited and semi-natural centers; realization of visit and information centers, thematically diversified, in every tourist center of the park according to the territorial plan order; constitution in every park center of at least one cooperative for tourist services delegated to the most important activities of productive, cultural and recreational character; construction of a fauna's area, destined to valuable animal species, different case by case; encouragement of handicraft activities, of agricultural-pastoral productions and of gastronomic specialty for tourism support, marketing of products through the image and the trade mark of the park (Cavuta, 1995).

At the meantime, the park represents an ecosystem which is fundamental for the preservation of life' essential functions, for the conservation of areas of elevated species difference, for the protection of landscapes, important from the cultural point of view that underline a harmonic relationship between man and nature. To all this, it must be added the sustainable use of natural resources, the recreational and educational uses of the ecosystems and the concrete application of a new relationship between man and natural environment.

Classification of the natural reserves

The international classification of parks was conceived, originally, by E. Bourdelle and published for the first time in 1948 in the essay entitled "*Essai d'unification de la nomenclature en matière de protecyion de la nature*". The text was approved by the UICN (International Union for the Protection of Nature) in 1956. According to the UICN the natural reserves are "territories or places, both in surface and in depth, on the ground or in the waters that, for general interest and especially scientific reasons, aesthetical or educational reasons, are subtracted from man's free intervention and submitted to the control of public authority with the scope to guarantee the preservation and protection of their fundamental natural characters." In Italy, in instituting the State's natural reserves, the classification proposed by the UICN has been followed, which is based, above all, on the finalities that are intend to be pursued. This classification is reported as follows.

All the territorial institutions assigned to the preservation of the natural environment are denominated "natural reserves" and therefore subdivided in:

1. general reserves
2. particular reserves

The general reserves (as to say, those instituted with the aim of global maintenance) are divided in three classes:

1. integral reserves
2. oriented or guided reserves
3. national parks

The particular reserves (instituted with the aim of sectorial conservation) are divided into two types that include, at the same time, different cases:

1. partial reserves:

- geological
- botanic
- zoological
- biological
- anthropological

2. special reserves:
- natural places
- natural monuments
- forests protection
- animal or vegetable repopulation.

We are soon able to notice that the national parks, the only type of park considered constitute a particular case of general reserve, of less protectionist severity compared to integral and guided reserves however, they are tied up to the common definition of "territories or places" according to the definition of the UICN (Pavan, 1973).

It is opportune, at this point, to contribute in clarifying the distinction between parks and reserves; such an explanation doesn't want to be entirely a glossary but, on the contrary, decisively structural, according to a precise institutional finality functionality. We will distinguish, therefore, the institutions directed to preserve the natural values *with* the man and *for* the man, from those finalized to the exclusive and specific protection of the nature. We will call the first ones "parks", and the latter "reserves." By the way, regarding the reserves, it is necessary to make a further precise statement. We must not deceive ourselves, in fact, to be able to fully actuate the protection of the environmental patrimony with plentiful institution of natural oasis that exclude the man; with a system of reserves, namely, founded upon the principle of separation between natural places and human demands. The park is a very different institution: it has to be located at the center of lifeful territorial relations of the natural region to which it belongs, proposing itself as an area with multiple uses, inserted in the processes of planning and defined as a qualifying element of the anthropicization. It is surely suggested by the characteristics of the natural region, but it is then made operative by the conditions of tangency and of intersection of the region itself with the human realities involved in its field of influence.

The E.C. normative on protected areas

Although there is an E.C. normative to protect some sectors of the problematic "environment", as for the protected areas we still have a lot time to wait. The priority economic interest in the E.C. politics explains the "relative and lateness indifference of the E.C. institutions for the problematic of areas at integral protection" (DI PLINIO, 1994). In the art. 130T of the E.C. Treaty there is only underlined that the E.C. has the power to prevent levels of protection lower than those of single States, but it gives the liberty to member states to take measures for a greater protection. The principle is also confirmed by the Maastricht Treaty.

In the fourth program of action on environment, there has been a greater concern for the demand of an ampler E.C. normative that protects all species belonging to flora and fauna together with their habitat. In order to implement this the Committee emanated, in 1988, a directive proposal that, some years later, was approved with the directive n. 43 of May 21 1992. Its purpose is to contribute to safeguard, within the European territory of member's States, the biodiversity, the new term that from sometime, has replaced the more "naïve" one of nature. The most innovative part of the directive is, without doubt, art. 3 with which a European system of protected areas is created. This ecological network is formed by the sites in which there are types of natural habitat, animal and vegetable species and it has the assignment to guarantee their quantity level and, when necessary, to re-establish a sufficient number for their conservation status. All the member States have to contribute to the institution of this project, individualizing in its own territory special zones of conservation.

From these E.C. rules principles some conclusions can be drawn such as:
- the E.C. philosophy about the protection of areas territorially defined is based on

the reduced concept of the role of habitat of the specie, more than on the naturalistic values in an ampler sense;

- the E.C., even recognizing the importance of protecting and preserving interesting areas, from the naturalistic-environmental point of view, privileges the anthropocentric and economical dimension on the relations between the protected zones and the activities together with human interest, that there are on the territory, allowing, even if as an exception, the sacrifice of the naturalistic interest, provided that the protection politics don't result, as a whole, compromised.

The E.C. normative is not binding, neither it imposes interpretative ways of law at national level, it only establishes its base principles. The Committee reserves to itself, in any case, to intervene if there are omitting behaviors or insufficient measures undertaken by the States regarding the territories to be protected.

Exactly for this motive, the Law n. 394 approved on December 6, 1991 is the first source to which refer when studying protected areas, since it has given a global order to the system of protected areas at a national level. It introduces an organic normative related to instituted procedures and to the management of protected areas and it accompanies the model with a system of incentives of different kinds, in order to attenuate the impact on ties imposed by the norms on people and on local autonomies.

The full implementation of the Law 394/91, and therefore, the starting of serious politics for the conservation of nature, is still far away. Delays are numerous and there are so many difficulties that are met in the delicate process for the institution of a protected area. To this it has to be added the slowness procedures to activate those measures of support foreseen by the law for the local populations, a slowness that jeopardize the climate of trust for a new model of conservation that also places, side by side, a guarantee of development and protection.

The man at the center of the park

The institution of natural protection areas is certainly one of the most binding aspects of the ecological theme, since it invests an ample range of values and territorial interests; it is a fact that on the theme about parks, in the recent past, we have had a considerable literary flowering and a lot of high attention from administrators, too often in this field, disorientated by so many theories and proposals and attracted by easy consents.

We are able, however, to ascertain how the national park, the major institute for nature conservation, or at least the most representative one, cannot, succeed today to satisfy all the demands that have imperiously emerged with the evolving of the conceptions of conservation and with the accumulation of experiences, often disappointing, accomplished in all the countries of the world, in contact with human and natural reality. The park is not able to furnish an answer suitable to the demands that today are set by a global ecology, which cannot become exhausted in the naturalistic field anymore, but it dilates to enclose more and more the interests of the territory, understood as habitat of human populations. What appears on the surface with always greater evidence is, in fact, the necessity of a philosophy of conservation that doesn't limit itself to defensive and passive positions toward natural resources, but that must commit itself towards the whole environment involving, also, every single man to an active participation. In this way, therefore, the parks stop constituting exclusively a naturalistic and ecological interest in a narrow sense, to become a problem of territorial, social, economic and political interest. With such presuppositions, the institution conception of a park will necessarily have to change and to evolve itself in order to acquire utility and credibility of contents and functions. The theme of the parks is, therefore, destined not to be for a longer time a question of borders, of territory margins, of islands to be protected, but to become the lymph of a new ethics of

administration of the whole territorial resource. At that point the history of the parks will flow in the history of the use that man makes of all the resources and that is, from remote times, the history of its same path on earth (Giacomini, Romani, 1982).

The considerations exposed up to this point already openly sustain, therefore, the necessity and the consequence to allocate, inside the same meaning of the parks and of the philosophy that informs the institution, the principle of the centrality of the human phenomenon. This affirmation shouldn't have to be understood as the return to a anthropocentric vision, neither should it be considered implicit a presumed condition of prevalence of man over nature; the centrality of the man is, first of all, the fruit of a realistic statement on the finality that every intent of natural environment protection must impose to itself in order to be believable and functional. Therefore, man must remember to recognize, with an awareness that burdens him of many responsibilities, his functional centrality and, under many conditions, even structural, delineating himself as creator of a environment belonging to him, within the nature, even though it will go trough inevitable modifications. After all, the most advanced conception of nature protection is certainly the one that sets man at the center of the ecological concern.

Therefore, the great meaning of park is above all human, since it is human the function that it has to absolve: "to seek new compatible behaviors between anthropic development and conservation of natural equilibriums, fixing the qualitative and quantitative parameters of such compatibility" (Giacomini, Romani, 1982, p. 53). This means to consider a park as place of activity and to ascertain the identity between the planning of a park and the economic-social planning of the same area. Then it is positive "to preserve", but not to crystallize: the ecosystems and, above all, the men are destined to constantly change, and to impose to the living communities in certain peripheral areas the persistence of backward kinds of life "with a pure museum-like purpose"; this is an offense to their right of growth and development (Barbieri, Canigiani, 1989, pp. 9-41). In other words, the planning of a park is to be intended as the study of a process able to route the collective conscience that guarantees the qualification of "compatible" to the models of the present development as well as the future one on the area; the park can be really, in this way, the tool for the realization of the territory and it will try to set up its own development through its own structures.

Speaking about parks is a theme that mostly trouble the theorists of environmental politics. It is a matter where the culture of the environment is set forehead of a truly examination. A mediation should be reached, where possible, among the increasing question of nature, activities and economic interests and the necessity of biotypes safeguard. Once the period of conflictuality is overcome, people start to understand that the park offers for certain areas a unique and non repeatable occasion, even in consideration of the complexity to translate the principles in operational actions. But this is the challenge of the sustainable development: for the parks to take off, even before fences and prohibitions, in the conscience and in the behaviors of everybody.

Benefits and aims of the park

In the constitutive Act of the National Park of Yellowstone, the first one in the world, there is written "for the benefit and the enjoyment of people and future generations." And, in fact, the benefits are numerous: economic, cultural, social, educational, urbane, territorial and scientific.

The park is the beginning of a real re-conversion of the territory, or better, of the habits of its transformation, awaiting that all its peculiarities become a general characteristic of a constant relationship between man and environment. The finalities of a park are, therefore, the characteristics that render explicit the functional physiognomy of it.

Premised that global finality is that to seek, to promote and to sustain a compatible cohabitation between natural ecosystem and human ecosystem, in the mutual safeguard of the territorial rights of preservation, evolution and development, the fundamental finalities in which it articulates are:

1. conservation, preservation and restoration of the natural ecosystems.
2. social economic and cultural promotion of the populations.
3. continuous scientific research, omni and interdisciplinary.
4. educational and formative didactic.
5. recreational and tourist fruition.

The *conservation* has to be positioned in the global ecological order, not only in a defensive and binding sense, but also in a constructive and re-constructive sense through the permanent intervention of man. The conservation is, therefore, active and the prevailing interest of natural preservation must be focused on the protection of nature's evolution, more than on static and museum-like preservation of their representative organisms. It appears clear, then, that the resources, the ecosystems, the landscapes object of conservation are not only those notched by antrophic actions or by natural events; similarly, regarding the resources to be kept: not only the natural ones, but also those that are human and particularly the cultural traditions, the ethnic and anthropological values, being them integral or in danger of decadence. The conservation of nature cannot, scientifically and historically, be separated from an identical conservation of those human expressions that, in intimate communion with the environment, have molded the foundations of any future development. Accordingly, the preservation and the management of the park must necessarily foresee the intelligent and respectful intervention by the man to improve the natural environments.

The economic, social and cultural promotion of the populations included in the area of influence of the park, is certainly the newest and, perhaps, the most controversial issue. If it is conceived in a binding sense, that is, as a structure that subtracts resources and rights, the institution of a park is accompanied by the principle of compensation: only a more modern expression from the old concept of "indemnification", with the conviction that it's rightful to furnish facilitations and support to people who, further than having a poor economy, is also burdened by a series of restrictive normative on the use of his own territorial resources. If, instead, a different politics is proposes, which promotes the development as well as the preservation, delineating the institute as an operation not deprived by economic ambitions in a productive sense, then the park can eliminate, from its origin, possible problems of indemnification and compensation. Furthermore, if it is true that the park do not just pursues scientific-naturalistic ends but also educational and social, then it must be linked to the surrounding human reality: also in relation to this, the final ends must be that of favoring the cultural and the economic development of local populations, to offer them new job occasions and the possibility to improve their standard of living. The institution of a protected area is tightly tied to the wish of the population, to the people's ecological conscience and the way with which it perceives and it appraises the environmental resources of the territory. It is therefore important to convince the local populations that the protection of the environment is of fundamental importance for their own interest. It is important, therefore, to help the local population to rediscover their own identity through the rediscovery of the native characters, of the traditions, of the cultural patrimony either forgotten or destroyed by the modern styles of life: a patrimony that must be recovered, even in the continuous improvement of both comfort and standard of living. The parks will become a strongly felt reality when the educational and information work, thanks to the men of culture, will be accomplished; in that case the parks will really be the expression of the moral conscience of a community that is not willing anymore to assist to

the environmental degrade and that feels compelled to give a contribution to protect the land where he belongs.

Through a modern management, the park can convey concrete advantages to the interested areas. In fact the zones where a park is instituted are, for the most, deprived of other resources, besides the natural and ecological ones. The first consequence deriving from the creation of a protected area is the birth or the increase of tourism and this can constitute a direct source of revenue: direct management of receptive structures, organization of refreshment places are stimulated by the existence of the park. Furthermore, the tourist flow brings a notable increase of typical local products request. It is necessary, therefore, to preserve the traditional tools and workmanship procedures. The agricultural products also have benefits from the existence of the park because they are protected by a trademark to guarantee their origin and the genuineness, and they can be advertised at a national level.

From the *scientific research* point of view, a park represents a true open-air laboratory, where to carry out studies and investigations about nature conservation. The research is a permanent qualitative and quantitative study of the equilibrated relationships between individuals and natural whole and between these and human activities, in the entire range of contact and conflicting situations, from the edge of the intact natural systems up to the zones of dominium of the entirely artificial ones. Intending in these terms the activity of research, the responsibility of a park towards scientific-naturalistic activities becomes considerably widened, reaching the target of a study on relations among elements. It must be also underlined the interdisciplinary and meta-disciplinary characteristics, in the sense that scientific researches that have as object the territory of the park shouldn't only be multidisciplinary but should tightly integrate itself to reach the understanding of that intimate logic that subtends the phenomenons and reveals the common evolutionary matrix of it.

The research should be finalized in a way that it should also offer concrete benefits to human development, both directly and indirectly, so that it's possible to find an immediate application field, an advantage also for other communities and territories that have similar problems for analogy of geographical, economic and social conditions.

Another purpose of the park is the process of education of visitors to the naturalistic, ecological and environmental values. By educating man to know and to correctly use the available resources, the park succeeds, also, in qualifying the visitor: through guided tour visits, services centers, ecological fields and numerous other activities, it is possible to offer the possibility to observe, in direct contact with nature, the life of plants, animals, ecosystems, and thus to easily understand the complex mechanisms that regulate natural processes. Besides, the park constitutes a structure at the service of the school for the education of the new generations. Once more it's important to admit how much, especially in this field, education is necessary; and not only for immediately practical goals, but also to spread the awareness of the totality and the immanence of ecological problems, captured in their singleness and in their whole, tightly consequential.

The *recreational and tourist fruition* represents the classical function of the parks and, in a certain sense, the one that can bring more novelties, above all if we make reference to a park so planned. In general, tourism must be planned toward a type of fruition that exalts the aspect of approaching as well as the nature and the local agricultural products. Park, therefore, as qualified social outfit and as creative assimilation of environment values: also in this case the finality must be put at the service of the human development, through a tourist promotion that suggests new incentives and new initiatives for the valorization of the areas, with a series of receptive and recreational outfits of a new conception and for a better use of the already existing traditional ones. The presence of the

park will inevitably induce some positive mutations inside the tourist dynamics of the area, if one already exists, with the beginning of a more qualified tourism which is less dependent from the periods of festivity, that will be able to allow an expansion of the actual working seasons to advantage a greater continuity of the accommodation industry and of the collateral ones. Naturally the tourist use of the park will impose a zoning and a normative for its fruition, attentively previously studied, calibrating the flows of visitors according to the tolerability of the varied territories. One of the methods to reach this objective is the individualization of an external area or "preparco", in which can be also found inhabited centers with "wider tourist activity that assumes a function of filter for the visitors." This system is now being introduced in Italy in some national and regional parks, especially for resolving the problem of mass tourism which is more and more diffused but it's not entirely ready to be a respectful fruition of the environment, as a result this could annul, really, the goal of naturalistic protection for which the park has been created. This opinion is not certainly shared by Giacomini and Romani, who retain the "preparco" an univocal and artificial destination, that doesn't only exalt the sense of the compatible fruition, but it creates dangers of tourist accumulations in the delicate areas. However tourism, and more exactly the echo-tourism, represents, inside the park, a sure occasion for jobs.

The plan: tool for park management

The Law foresees the obligation to base the management of both the national parks (art. 12), and of the regional natural parks (art. 25) on specific levels, but it introduces two distinctions to be mentioned, which have scarce comparison with the institutions of the other European countries:

a.) the plan of the park configures itself as an omni-comprehensive plan, clearly distinguished from any other plan of the territorial and landscaping context, that replaces at every level, inside the park confinements;

b.) the plan of the park (predisposed by the park management body with the approval of the competent Region) it is clearly distinguished by the pluri-annual economic and social plan for the promotion of compatible activities (predisposed, for national parks, by the park community and approved by the Region, upon conforming opinion of the corporate management body).

The clear distinction between the inside planning of the park and the external one, evidently contrasts with the demand of strong interrelations among the processes of planning and management that develop within the territory, for which the park borders have a scarce meaning. The European experience and, still more, the American experience show, instead, an increasing attention for the development of cooperative forms through borders: as the National Park Service recommends (1988) "through the planning, the parks have to be considered in the amplest context of the surrounding region." As for the second distinction, it contrasts with the demand to adequately keep into account, inside the general plans of the parks, the problems and of the perspectives of economic and social development of the context. Also to this respect, the emerging orientations in Europe go to the other direction, with attempts that are more or less effective of strong connection of protection politics with those of promotion, that find in the integrated planning their most solid base. Problems like these obviously weigh on what is asked to the parks, particularly what concerns the three principal functions of spatial diversification of the protection action, of definition of management strategies and choices legitimization (GAMBINO, 1994).

With reference to the tendentialy integrated plans, that is, to those that consider, with varied degree of detail, a plurality of contents, the Italian Law (L. n. 394/1991, art. 12)

individualizes the contents of the park plan: in the general organization of the territory with an articulation in areas or parts characterized by diversified forms of usage, enjoyment and protection; in the systems of vehicular and pedestrian accessibility, with particular respect to the path and to the structures reserved to handicap carriers and to the elderly people; in the systems of equipments and services for the management and the economic function of the park (museums, visit centers, information offices, camping areas, agro-tourism activity etc.); and in pointing out the criterions for the interventions on flora, on fauna and on natural environment.

As it is easy to notice, it's dealing with contents that can express both the strategic indications of the plan (for instance, for the general organization, the systems of accessibility or services, direction of naturalistic management) and the discipline of the uses and the activities. But while the first mentioned ones find, in the logic of the L. n. 394, a problematic limit in the already recalled territory separation of the park from the external area, the discipline of the uses and the activities assumes, instead, a central importance, in relation to the zoning that the same law suggests. According to the law L. n. 394, the subdivision of the park in zones or parts should actually foresee:

Zone A. **Integral Reserve** – The territory is fundamentally intact and deserves absolute conservation, with prohibition to make any alteration of the environment, except possible limited necessary interventions for the safeguard of certain environmental components. The access to the visitors is allowed only on foot, along preset obligatory itineraries, preferably with the help of park's guards and guides. The scientific research and naturalistic observation are admitted on the base of special authorization. It foresees the acquisition of all the land by the park authority.

Zone B. **General Reserve** – The territory is well preserved, with signs of the secular human presence, and it deserves to be maintained in this state favoring, in parallel with the social-economic evolution, its gradual re-conversion toward native and spontaneous aspects. The preexisting traditional economic activities, usually agro-silvo-pastoral, are possible under the park profile and, where necessary, with some limitations. The handworks and the existing structures can be maintained or restored. It is not allowed to realize new initiatives that were not decided upon and promoted by the park authority. The access of visitors is allowed, on foot or with different means, in consideration to what has been established by the park itself. It foresees the acquisition of the land by the authority park, for short and long term.

Zone C. **Protection** – The territory is anhtropized, with semi-natural environment characteristics that deserve to be maintained in tight fusion between native and human elements trying to favor some possibilities of multiple use of the territory. Traditional economic activities, in certain cases, can be promoted, reconverted, strengthened in the respect of present uses and the customs. The access of the visitors is free.

Zone D. **Development** – The territory is already largely antropized, but there are tendencies that should be directed and appropriately reconverted. It is destined, therefore, to the demands of the local collectivities and to the fruition of the park visitors, in full harmony with the development and the revitalization of the preexisting installations. This zone is understood to allow: the realization of the necessary conditions for the life and the development of local collectivities; the creation of the essential receptive and complementary infrastructures; the creation of the principal organizational equipments and service of the park.

In the classification indicated by the Law that, as it is known, it is the result of weary negotiations and fatiguing mediations in the long process for the formation of the law, it is not easy to compare the areas to the objectives of management to be pursued in every one of them. In fact, the differentiation of the zones, as per above, seems substantially

reported to the different incidence of the ties and the limitations, rather than to the difference of the objectives that, even in the picture of the finalities altogether entrusted to the park, should owe in everyone of them, be pursued: not only by forbidding or limiting but also by promoting and intervening, with articulated reference to the difference of the sites, of the resources and of the conditions.

Toward a "culture" of the environment

It is true that the problems of the environment can be reassumed in the demand of a new culture able to produce a new model of economic development. But who knows how much road we will need to travel for recomposing the relationship man-environment!

Modern culture has lost itself in this drama. From Smith to Keynes, from Ricardo to Marx, the classical economic research has expelled the nature and the man from the construction of its models of development. To recompose to unity the creative presence of the man on the planet is the huge assignment of the new culture and, therefore, of the new economy.

The crisis that we live is the point of arrival of a dissociation: but before everything else it will be necessary to defend what exists. The new culture cannot leave out of consideration the fundamental actor that is the man, who has lavished too much energy in violating the nature. The nature is not an amorphous mass to which the man has to give sense, using it as he believes. If the environment is recovered and developed in terms of meaning, the culture of the environment will have to be able to determine new styles of life among which the sobriety, the responsibility and the wisdom but, above all, it will have to be able to overcome two misunderstandings that have dominated our epoch: the scientific and technical reductivism and the despotic and utilitarian dominion on the nature. The scientific and technical reductivism has prevented the man to catch the environment as a "system of relationships", made of components, factors and processes. Then despotic utilitarianism has justified the total appropriation of the nature to its own goals. These two factors require, from one side, a new reflection on the management of power, that today appears threatening more and more, and, from the other hand, the recovery in the global sense where the detail acquires consistence and value.

The future of the civilization, therefore, is not only of technical order, but it depends on the quality of the subjective attitudes and on the dispositions of the human liberty. In the contrary it will be the strength of the facts or the political constraint, to force to mend the disasters already in place, with a very high price to pay.

FOOTNOTES

1 Law, August 8 1985 n. 431, known as "Galasso Law", from the name of the proponent minister.

2 in the urban programs, of geographers, economists and of the historians "the ecological imperative" tends to prevail. SEGRE, DANSERO, 1996.

3 the expansion of the protected areas in Europe in the last decades has been spectacular. Limiting it to natural parks, can be relieved, from investigations carried out at a European base, that of the 33 Nations investigated, the number of parks has increased from the existing 60 in the fifties to over 600 in 1995, while their surface increased from just more than 20.000 Square Kms. to almost 250.000 Square Kms. - SEGRE, DANSERO, 1996, PP. 187-188.

4 For a detailed explanation of the meaning of the single components relating to the different typologies of natural reserves, see DACLON, page 25-27, Tassi 1979

5 (edited by the) Environment Ministry, 1993.

6 The local populations consider restrictions and prohibitions as limitations imposed to their liberty to act; this is a very unpleasant limitation because it's imposed by outside organs exctely on the territory that they consider traditionally to be their own pertinence. S. PINNA, 1995.

7 The idea of eco-tourism is rapidly spreading in the world as a solution suggested because of many of the harmful effects that mass tourism (MT) produces on the environmental and socio-economic conditions. However, there is not a general agreement on the meaning of the term. It's preferred to speak of "development of a sustainable tourism", which is understood as "a type of tourism effected in a form and to a level that maintain it functional through time without involving a

degrade or alteration of the environment, in general sense, within which it can persist preventing the emerging and the spreading of activity or competitive process on an exclusive profitable base only." This definition sustains the important concept of equity, as it has been promulgated by the "World Commission on Environment and Development." INTERNET, HTTP: / / WWW. Parks. it /

8 The "defensive expenses" have to be organically calculated within the G.O.P. in order to have them calculated without including necessary costs for environmental recover. LEONE, 2002.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barbieri, G., (1971), *Per una politica di tutela del paesaggio*, in Atti Istit. Geogr. Univ. di Firenze.

Barbieri, G., (1989), *Evoluzione del concetto e della funzione dei parchi nella politica del territorio e dell'ambiente. Tesi per un dibattito*, in G. BARBIERI, F. CANIGIANI (edited by), *Le ragioni dei parchi e l'Italia protetta*, Istituto di Geografia dell'Università, Firenze, pp. 9-41.

Barbieri, G., Canigiani, F., Cassi, L., (1991), *Geografia dell'ambiente*, Torino, UTET.

Bresso M., (1993), *Per un'economia ecologica*, Roma, La Nuova Italia Scientifica.

Cavuta, G., (1997), *Il sistema delle aree protette nel quadro della conservazione del territorio e dello sviluppo eco-compatibile. Il Parco Nazionale della Maiella*, in «Boll. della Soc. Geogr. Ital.», Roma, fasc. n. 1-2, pp. 231-249.

Cavuta, G., (1995), *Parks project and compatible development for the Abruzzo mountains*, in SCARAMELLINI G. (edited by), "Sustainable Development of Mountain Communities", Milano, Guerini e Ass., pp. 195-204.

Cavuta, G., (2004), "*Protezione del paesaggio e pianificazione ambientale*", in «L'UNIVERSO» Istituto Geografico Militare, anno LXXXIV – n. 3, pp. 318-339.

Cardinale, B., Cavuta, G., (1995), *Economia e territorio: il Parco nazionale del Gran Sasso e dei Monti della Laga*, in «Notizie dell'economia», Teramo, n° 5-6, pp. 63-78.

Daclon, C. M., (1995), *I parchi nazionali*, Milano.

Di Plinio, G., (1994), *Diritto pubblico dell'ambiente e aree naturali protette*, Torino, UTET.

Fuschi, M., (1997), *A margine di alcune considerazioni sull'ambiente: il Parco Regionale Sirente-Velino*, in «Boll. della Soc. Geogr. Ital.», Roma, fasc. n. 1-2, pp. 251-265.

Gambino, R., (1994), (edited), *I parchi naturali europei*, Nis, Roma.

Giacomini, V., Romani, V., (1992), *Uomini e parchi,* Milano, F. Angeli.

Landini, P., Leone, V., (1984), *Ipotesi di un parco naturale nella duna di Lesina. Un approccio interdisciplinare*, in memories of Soc. Geogr. Ital., vol. XXXIII , Pisa, Pacini ed.

Leone, U., (2002), *Una nuova politica per l'ambiente*, Roma, Carocci ed.

Pinna, M., (1995), *I parchi nel moderno rapporto tra uomo e natura*, quoted by S. PINNA, op. cit., p. 294.

Pinna, S., (1995), *La protezione ambientale*, Milano, F. Angeli.

Predieri, A., (1981), voce "Paesaggio", *Enciclopedia del Diritto*, Giuffrè, Milano, vol. 31, p. 503.

Pavan M., (1973), *Le riserve naturali italiane*, Ministero agricoltura e foreste, collana verde n. 31.

Pavan, M., (1985), *L'azione del consiglio d'Europa in materia di parchi ed aree protette*, in Atti del Convegno «PARCHI ED AREE PROTETTE», p. 87.

Segre, A., Dansero, E., (1996) *Politiche per l'ambiente. Dalla natura al territorio*, Torino UTET.

Tassi, F., (1979), *Parchi Nazionali*, Firenze, La Nuova Italia.