PROGRESSUS
Rivista di Storia Scrittura e Società

# Southern Italy in the land register of 1929

GAETANO MORESE

Anno III, n. 1, luglio 2016
ISSN 2284-0869

UNIVERSITÀ DI SIENA
1240

**Abstract**

Among the useful sources to rebuild a detailed, but certainly not complete, picture of the agricultural arrangement of the kingdom of Italy around the thirties, there is surely the so called land register of 1929, published by the Italian central institute of statistics, in which there is interesting data related to different aspects of national agriculture. Specifically in this essay, I shall use this land register to rebuild the southern Italian context that the same register identified as one of the geographical regions that made up the Italian kingdom. On the basis of this data, there is a first level of analysis that focuses on the relationship between the overall national data and the southern ones. The second level of analysis instead evaluates the southern data in relation to the five compartments that geographically and administratively composed that area, under the various forms in which the register groups them. The articulation of the demographic component, the spread of farms and of their conduction types, the articulation of surfaces, their use and type of productions present, are data that the land register of 1929 make available, not only for an analysis of agrarian structure, but also to acquire useful information for the history of the agricultural landscape.

**Key words**

Land register; statistics; agriculture; southern Italy; demography;farms; land; productions

Fra le fonti utili per ricostruire un quadro articolato, ma certamente non esaustivo, dell'assetto agrario del regno d'Italia attorno agli anni Trenta del XX secolo vi è certamente il così detto Catasto agrario del 1929, pubblicato dall'Istituto centrale di statistica e che riporta interessanti dati connessi a diversi aspetti dell'agricoltura nazionale. In particolare in questo contributo mi avvarrò del Catasto agrario per ricostruire il contesto del meridione italiano che lo stesso catasto identificava come una delle aree geografiche che componevano il regno d'Italia. Seguendo lo stesso presentarsi dei dati all'interno del catasto, vi è un primo livello di analisi che si concentra sul rapporto fra i dati complessivi nazionali e quelli meridionali. Il secondo livello di analisi invece considera i dati meridionali in rapporto ai cinque compartimenti che lo componevano geograficamente e amministrativamente, considerati nelle varie for-

me in cui il catasto li raggruppa. Articolazione della componente demografica, diffusione delle aziende agrarie e delle tipologie di conduzione, articolazione delle superfici, del loro utilizzo e del tipo di produzioni presenti su di esse, sono i dati che il catasto agrario del 1929 rende disponibili non solo per una analisi dell'assetto agrario, ma anche per ricavare utili informazioni per la storia del paesaggio agrario.

**Parole chiave**

Catasto agrario; statistica; agricoltura; Italia meridionale; demografia; aziende agricole; territorio; produzione

### 1. The land register of 1929

Royal decree n. 3203 (30 December, 1923) established the Institute of economics and agricultural statistics in the ministry of National economy. This Institute was constituted in 1925 by royal decree n. 1765 (9 October, 1924) with the aim, among other things, to compile, update and publish the agricultural and forestland registers. The agricultural and forestry statistics with law n. 1162 (July 1926) was also entrusted to the Central institute of statistics and then royal decree n. 1036 (2 June, 1927) transformed the Institute of economics and agricultural statistics into the Institute of agricultural economy, as an organ of the Central institute of statistics for which, in 1929, edited the national land register [1]. The land register is mainly an indirect statistical entry and it provides a picture of the state of the territory, which dynamically changed by the yearly agrarian production. It also provides a picture of the agricultural landscape through the data and information available of the basic character of the territory, in particular, the less modified such as long life cycle cultivations, or ones which are stable [2]. The land register has a no fiscal feature because it brings material data without any indication of properties or taxable production, as in the geometrical land register. In the land register, which has agronomic qualities, there is an evaluation of the cultivation mass, while the geometrical land register, which has an economic and fiscal nature, shows geometric and

[1] See *L'ordinamento della statistica ufficiale*, a cura di R. Tomei, Milano, Giuffrè, 2006; *La storia della statistica pubblica in Italia*, a cura di L.L. Rondini, Milano, F. Angeli, 2003; M.L. D'Autilia, *L'amministrazione della statistica nell'Italia fascista: il caso dell'agricoltura*, Roma, Gangemi, 1992; P. Magnarelli, *L'agricoltura italiana fra politica e cultura: breve storia dell'Istituto nazionale di economia agraria*, Milano, Edizioni di Comunità, 1981; P. Albertario, *Il nuovo catasto agrario*, in "Giornale degli Economisti", XLVIII, 1933, pp. 349-370; Inea, *Cenni sull'ordinamento e sull'attività dell'Istituto Nazionale di Economia Agraria (gennaio 1928-marzo 1932)*, Roma, Tip. Operaia Romana, 1931; Id., *Disposizioni riguardanti l'Istituto di Economia Agraria*, Roma, Provveditorato Generale dello Stato Libreria, 1928; N. Mazzocchi Alemanni, *I servizi della statistica agraria e il nuovo catasto agrario,* in "Atti della R. Accademia dei Georgofili", s. 5, XXVII, 1930.

[2] See G. Garavini, *La formazione del catasto agrario: istruzioni per i rilevatori della provincia di Siena*, Siena, Tip. Cooperativa Ex Combattenti, 1930; L. Franciosa, *I problemi del catasto*, in "Giornale degli Economisti", XLIX, 1934, pp. 156-169.

particle data collected on the ground[3]. In detail, in the land register all surfaces are considered: the productive surface including wild crops, also those not used; as well as the unproductive ones. The productive surface is divided according to the cultivation quality: arable land, permanent grassland, permanent grassland-pastures, permanent pastures or specialized woody cultivation. Every quality is also distinguished between simple cultivation or mixed with woody plants. Likewise, uncultivated productive lands can be in simple cultivation, with woody plants or with mostly wood production. Arable lands include crop rotation (cereals, fodder, vegetables) and fallow land in a cycle within the decade. Permanent grassland, grassland-pastures and pastures are lands which are never worked or have not been worked for more than ten years, producing only fodder, while forests are lands with forest woody plants (including chestnut, walnut and hazelnut). Specialized woody cultivations are those that produce annual fruit (olive groves, citrus groves, almond groves, orchards, mulberry groves, vineyards), uncultivated productive lands are those barren or which give a limited wild production. In the land register there are also integral and repeated surfaces: those on which there are simultaneously more herbaceous plants (subsidiary cultivation or in succession), those with more woody plants (mixed cultivation) or those with both herbaceous and woody plants (promiscuous cultivation). These extensions are indicated once as an integral surface based on the predominant culture for area or per cycle, and a second time as repeated indicating the secondary culture and this data is important for landscape history. Land quality is divided into four classes: excellent, good, mediocre and poor and the territory is also divided into the mountainous, hilly or plain agricultural regions. The land register is not an economic or analytic source, but rebuilds a synthetic rural and agricul-

[3] The geometric land register was established by law n. 3682 (1 March, 1886) and later was regulated by the consolidation act n. 1572 (8 October, 1931). See C. Manaresi, *Estimo censuario: formazione, attivazione e conservazione del catasto. I vecchi catasti italiani, il nuovo catasto terreni (rilevamenti e stime), il catasto fabbricati, il catasto agrario, con numerosi modelli ed esempi*, Torino, Lavagnolo, 1939; F. Pollastri, *Il catasto geometrico fondiario ed il catasto agrario*, Roma, Tipografia delle Terme, 1933.

tural picture of the Italian kingdom, its geographical areas (northern, central, southern, island), its agricultural regions, its compartments, provinces and cities. In practical terms it is a descriptive and summary source that helps us to detect the essential characteristics of Italian agriculture around the '30s, in its articulations by extension and quality, basic and characterizing, spatial as productive [4].

## 2. Territory, population and types of farms

The Italian territory according to the land register included over 28.5 million ha of productive land (agricultural and forest) and around 2.5 million ha of unproductive land, 41% of the territory was in the north, 24% in the south, 19% in the center and 16% on the islands, a fifth of the land was flat and the rest was divided between mountains and hills, this last a little more prevalent. Fifteen percent of the unproductive and 24% of the productive lands in the kingdom were in the south, whose territory, of more than 7.3 million ha, was 95% productive and 5% unproductive lands [5]. The national territory included 28% hills, 23% moun-

[4] The land register published by Istat includes a volume with a general report (Roma, Poligrafico, 1939), a volume with general tables (Roma, Poligrafico, 1936), 94 volumes (published between 1932 and 1936), one for each province of the 19 compartments of the kingdom, and finally a volume concerning periods of seeding and harvesting for major cultivations (Roma, Poligrafico 1937). The volumes of the southern provinces were published respectively in 1933 (Bari, Brindisi, Matera), in 1934 (Lecce, Taranto, Potenza), in 1935 (Campobasso, Chieti, Teramo, Avellino, Benevento, Salerno, Reggio Calabria), and in 1936 (Aquila, Pescara, Napoli, Foggia, Catanzaro and Cosenza). See L.O. Bercaw, A.M. Hennay, *Bibliography on land utilization, 1918-1936*, Washington, Government printing office, 1938, pp. 1098-1128.

[5] See *Storia e misura: indicatori sociali ed economici nel Mezzogiorno d'Italia (secoli XVIII-XX)*, a cura di R. De Lorenzo, Milano, F. Angeli, 2007; *Studi sull'agricoltura italiana. Società rurale e modernizzazione*, a cura di P.P. D'Attorre e A. De Bernardi, Milano, Feltrinelli, 1994; S. Monti, *Il Mezzogiorno agricolo nel tempo e nello spazio*, Napoli, Loffredo, 1988; *Trasformazione delle società rurali nei paesi dell'Europa occidentale e mediterranea (secoli XIX-XX): bilancio degli studi e prospettive di ricerca. Atti del Congresso internazionale svoltosi a Napoli e Sorrento dal 25 al 28 ottobre 1982*, a cura di P. Villani, Napoli, Guida, 1986; *Problemi di storia delle campagne meridionali nell'età moderna e contemporanea*, a cura di A. Massafra, Bari, Dedalo, 1981; M. Bandini, *Cento anni di storia agraria italiana*, Roma, Cinque lune, 1957;V. Ricchioni, *Studi storici di economia dell'agricoltura meridionale*, Firenze, Macrì, 1952.

tains and 16% plains which were in the south, whose agricultural and forest land, however, was 49% hills, 37% mountains and 14% plains, while unproductive southern lands were 47% hills, 39% mountains and 14% plains. There was a quarter of the total national area and a quarter of its productive lands in southern Italy. The Italian population indicated in the land register was over 41 million inhabitants present, 30 million in urban areas and about 11 million in diffuse centers, 23% of Italian population was in the south where there were 19% in the urban centers and 4% in the diffuse centers, inhabitants of the kingdom. In the south, there were more than 9.6 million inhabitants of which 83% in urban areas and 17% in diffuse centers. In the kingdom, there were 133 inhabitants per square km of land, 0.75 ha of land per capita, and 144 people per square km of agricultural and forest surface. In the south, there were 132 inhabitants per square km of land and 139 people per square km of agricultural and forest surface, these values were second to those of the north. Again almost a quarter of the total kingdom data was in the south where the urban component prevailed, considering that 22% of the 7311 Italian cities were in the south, with a prevalence of hill centers and of centers between one thousand and twenty-five thousand inhabitants. In addition, southern Italy had the national record for cities with a population between twenty-five thousand and fifty thousand inhabitants. The initial data allows us to reflect on the process of the formation of the southern urban realities and on the effort to drain the population from cities to the coutryside,

[6] See M. Stampicchia, *«Ruralizzare l'Italia». Agricoltura e bonifiche tra Mussolini e Serpieri (1928-1943)*, Milano, Franco Angeli, 2000; C. Ipsen, *Dictating demography, the problem of population in fascist Italy*, Cambridge, University Press, 1996, tras. by G. Cuberli, Bologna, Il mulino, 1997; L. Bortolotti, *Il mito della colonizzazione interna in Italia, 1850-1950*, in "Storia Urbana", XV, 1991, 57, pp. 88-168; A. Massafra, S. Russo, *Microfondi e borghi rurali nel Mezzogiorno*, in *Storia dell'agricoltura italiana in età contemporanea*, a cura di P. Bevilacqua, Venezia, Marsilio, 1989, vol. I, pp. 181-228; A. Mioni, *Urbanistica fascista. Ricerche e saggi sulle città e il territorio e sulle politiche urbane in Italia tra le due guerre*, Milano, F. Angeli, 1980; A. Treves, *Le migrazioni interne nell'Italia fascista*, Torino, G. Einaudi, 1976; F. Colletti, *La popolazione rurale in Italia e i suoi caratteri demografici e sociali*, Piacenza, Federazione Italiana dei Consorzi Agrari, 1925.

according to the articulated fascist population policy[6]. Among the southern compartments, the largest was Puglia with 26% of the territory and 27% of agricultural and forest area of the south, while Lucania with 14% was the least for the extent and the agricultural and forest surfaces. On an average, unproductive land in relation to the compartments surface was 5% for each one, while considering the total southern data more unproductive extensions were in Calabria (27%) and Abruzzo-Molise (22%), lower in Lucania (13%). Southern population was divided between the maximum values of Campania (36%) and Puglia (26%), and the minimum of Lucania (5%). The agricultural and forest area per inhabitant was 1.8 ha in Lucania, 0.9 ha in Abruzzo-Molise, 0.8 ha in Calabria, 0.7 ha in Puglia and 0.3 ha in Campania. The compartments with the largest share of urban population were Puglia and Campania, while those with more diffuse population were Campania, Abruzzo-Molise and Calabria. According to the land register data related to the 1931 census, farm households in the kingdom were 42% of the total and its components were 49% of the population. The Italian family heads working in agriculture were divided into direct conductors (40%), day laborers (27%), settlers (15%), renters (11%) and other agricultural activity workers (7%). In southern Italy, there were 29% farm households of the kingdom and their components were 26% of national data, considering instead the relation between agricultural and total population 53% of the southern population was agricultural. Compared to the national data, the prevalence of householders who were renters (38%) was recorded in southern Italy, followed by those who were day laborers (36%), and then direct conductors (27%), noting that the southern data for day laborers was greater than the northern one. Considering instead only the southern data, values are reversed, prevailing householders who were direct conductors (37%), followed by day laborers (34%) and renters (14%). The components of the southern agricultural households, in relation to the kingdom and according to the activity of the householder, were mainly divided into day laborers (34%), renters (32%) and direct conductors (26%), while consid-

ering only the southern data, components of direct conductor families were mainly (39%), followed by components of day laborers (30%) and then of renters (15%). Southern direct conductors were more present in Abruzzo-Molise (30%), Campania (28%) and Puglia (20%), less in Calabria (16%) and Lucania (7%). Considering the householder of the agricultural sector in the compartments, householder direct conductors were 59% in Abruzzo-Molise, 38% in Campania and Lucania, 29% in Calabria and 28% in Puglia. The southern householder renters were 48% in Campania, 18% in Puglia, 13% in Calabria, 12% in Abruzzo-Molise and 9% in Lucania, while householder renters in the compartments were 26% in Campania, 18% in Lucania, 10% in Puglia and 9% in Abruzzo-Molise and Calabria. The southern settler householders were 32% in Calabria, 28% in Abruzzo-Molise, 19% in Puglia, 17% in Campania and 4% in Lucania, while compared to each compartment householder settlers were 13% in Abruzzo-Molise and Calabria, 6% in Campania and Puglia, 5% in Lucania. The day laborer householders in the south were divided into 39% in Puglia, 25% in Calabria, 21% in Campania, 9% in Abruzzo-Molise and Lucania, while considering each compartment householder day laborers were 50% in Puglia, 41% in Calabria, 29% in Lucania, 26% in Campania and 17% in Abruzzo-Molise. Finally, the householders involved in other agricultural activities in the south were 32% in Calabria, 27% in Puglia, 21% in Campania, 12% in Lucania and 8% in Abruzzo-Molise, while in each compartment householders involved in other agricultural activities were 10% in Lucania, 9% in Calabria, 6% in Puglia, 4% in Campania and 2% in Abruzzo-Molise[7]. According to the land reg-

[7] See E. Turbati, *Rapporti fra proprietà, impresa e mano d'opera nell'agricoltura italiana, Calabria*, Roma, F.lli Treves dell'Ali, 1929; L. Franciosa, *Rapporti fra proprietà, impresa e mano d'opera nell'agricoltura italiana, Abbruzzi e Molise*, Roma, F.lli Treves dell'Ali, 1930; Id., *Rapporti fra proprietà, impresa e mano d'opera nell'agricoltura italiana, Basilicata*, Roma, F.lli Treves dell'Ali, 1930; A. Brizi, L. Franciosa, *Rapporti fra proprietà, impresa e mano d'opera nell'agricoltura italiana, Campania*, Roma, F.lli Treves dell'Ali, 1931; G. Nardini, *Rapporti fra proprietà, impresa e mano d'opera nell'agricoltura italiana, Puglia*, Roma, F.lli Treves dell'Ali, 1935.

ister in southern Italy there were 26% of the national farms on 24% of the national agricultural and forest area, divided by 30% farms with 1-5 ha extension, 29% with over 100 ha, 26% with 0-1 ha, 20% with 5-20 ha and 17% with 20-100 ha. In detail, southern farms of 0-1 ha were 35% of the total in the south, those of 1-5 ha were 49%, those of 5-10 ha were 10%, those of 10-20 ha were 4%, those of 20-50 ha were 2%, those of 50-100 ha were 0.5%, those of 100-500 ha were 0.45% and finally those of more than 500 ha were 0.1% of the total southern farms. Small farms with an extension of up to one ha were present on 6% of the southern agricultural and forest areas, those with 1-5 ha were on 19%, those with 5-10 ha on 11%, those with 10-20 ha and 20-50 ha were respectively on 8%, those with 50-100 ha on 6%, those with 100-500 ha on 15% and those with more than 500 ha accounted for 20% of the southern agricultural and forest surface. Considering the single compartments, small farms were more widespread in Calabria, Campania and Puglia, those with 1-5 ha predominated in Abruzzo-Molise, Puglia and Campania, those with 5-10 ha in Lucania, Abruzzo-Molise and Puglia. Whereas considering the larger farms, those with 10-20 ha were more widespread again in Lucania, Abruzzo-Molise and Puglia, those with 20-50 ha, 50-100 ha, 100-500 ha and over 500 ha were mainly in Lucania, Puglia and Calabria. So, not only the middle farms (1-20 ha), but also and especially the extended one (20-500 ha) were widespread in Lucania, while small farms (1-10 ha) were more present in Abruzzo-Molise, Puglia e Campania. Considering instead the farms based on the type of conduction, in 1929 according to the land register, southern farms were 26% of the national one. Among the southern farms those of mixed conduction were 35%, direct economy 26%, rented 25% and settled 17%. Whereas, considering the extension in southern Italy, all farms contained 25% of the extension of the kingdom, while considering farms by type of conduction, those which were mixed contained 35% of the agrarian and forest area of the kingdom, rented 26%, direct economy 24% and settled 9%. Instead, in the south, 59% of the farms were in direct conduction equal to around 60% of the con-

cerned area, the mixed farms were 20% and interested 21% of the surface. The less presence of conduction were the rented farms with 13% of the southern farms with 14% of the surface, while settled farms were 8% and concerned 6% of the surface. In southern Italy, the most widespread, by number and extension, was the direct conduction, followed by the mixed, while lower incidences had settled, except in Abruzzo-Molise and Calabria, where this type of conduction, compared to the reality of the individual compartments, accounted respectively for 10% and 12% of farms. Lower incidences for type of conduction had, instead, the rented farms in Abruzzo-Molise and Calabria which accounted respectively for 6% and 9%, in relation to their respective compartment farms [8].

### 3. Surfaces and cultivations

In southern Italy, there were 24% of agrarian and forest areas of the kingdom, while considering the same data in relation to only the south it accounted for 27% in Puglia, 21% in Abruzzo-Molise, 20% in Calabria, 18% in Campania and 14% in Lucania.

[8] See G. Massullo, *Contadini: la piccola proprietà coltivatrice nell'Italia contemporanea*, in *Storia dell'agricoltura italiana* cit., vol. II, 1990, pp. 45-103; S. Lupo, *I proprietari terrieri nel Mezzogiorno*, ivi, pp. 105-149; *Mezzogiorno e fascismo, atti del Convegno nazionale Salerno-Monte S. Giacomo, 11-14 dicembre 1975*, a cura di P. Laveglia, Napoli, Esi, 1978, vol. II; G. Lorenzoni, *Inchiesta sulla piccola proprietà formatasi nel dopoguerra, vol. XV, relazione generale*, Roma, Istituto Nazionale di economia agraria, 1939; A. Serpieri, *Lezioni di economia e politica agraria*, Firenze, Barbera, 1937; G. Lasorsa, *Indagini sulle distribuzioni delle proprietà terriere e delle aziende agricole in Italia*, in "Economia", XVIII, 5, 1936; R. Canosa, *Storia dell'Abruzzo nel ventennio fascista*, Ortona, Menabò, 2006; A. C. Pelino, *Politica fascista e piccola proprietà coltivatrice, il caso dell'Abruzzo*, in "Rivista abruzzese di studi storici dal fascismo alla resistenza", I, 1980, 3, pp. 37-85; L. Picardi, *Cattolici e fascismo nel Molise, 1922-1943*, Roma, Studium, 1995; G. Saluppo, *Molise, interventismo, dopoguerra, fascismo*, Campobasso, Italia, 1994; M. Barnabei, *Fascismo e nazionalismo in Campania, 1919-1925*, Roma, Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1975; R. Colapietra, *La Capitanata nel periodo fascista, 1926-1943*, Foggia, Amministrazione provinciale di Capitanata, 1978; S. Colarizi, *Dopoguerra e fascismo in Puglia, 1919-1926*, Bari, Laterza, 1970; C. Conte, *Bruciare le tappe: aspetti e problemi della modernizzazione fascista in Basilicata*, Rionero in Vulture, CalicEditori, 2004; A. Arcomano, *Campagne e fascismo in Basilicata e nel Mezzogiorno*, Manduria, Lacaita, 1981; F. Cordova, *Il fascismo nel Mezzogiorno: le Calabrie*, Soveria Mannelli, Rubbettino, 2003.

Twenty percent of the Italian simple cultivation areas were recorded in the south, while those with woody plants were 22%. In relation to the surface for quality crops, 26% of the national arable land was southern, than divided into 33% in exclusive cultivation and 14% with woody plants, in relation to the respective total national values. Simple arable land predominated in Puglia (31%) and Abruzzo-Molise (23%), while land with woody plants was more widespread in Abruzzo-Molise (34%) and Campania (33%). Fifty percent of Italian grassland was in the south and in particular 2% of the simple one and 0.7% of that with woody plants. Considering only the data of southern Italy, Campania and Abruzzo-Molise held the major southern extension in complex (respectively 50% and 34%) and of simple grassland (46% and 38% respectively), while Campania held 94% of the southern grassland with woody plants. In the south there was 11% of the total national grassland-pasture surface, in detail 15% of the Italian simple and 1% of those with woody plants of the kingdom. Considering only the south, the greater extension of grassland-pastures was recorded in Campania (49%) and Abruzzo-Molise (32%), compartments where simple grassland-pastures also prevailed (respectively 49% and 33%), while grassland-pastures with woody plants were present in Campania (58%), followed by Lucania (27%). Whereas, considering only pastures, the south recorded 26% of their area of the kingdom, while in detail southern pastures were 23% simple and 33% with woody plants. More extension of southern pastures was in Puglia (27%) and Lucania (26%), considering the simple pastures major extension, in relation to the south, was in Puglia (28%) and Abruzzo-Molise (23%), while for southern pastures with woody plants major extension was in Lucania (37%) and Puglia (25%). The southern surface cultivated with specialized woody plants was 47% of the national data and among compartments greater values related to the south were in Puglia (54%) and Calabria (21%). Southern forests accounted for 19% of the related national surface and major extension, compared to the southern total data, was in Calabria (36%), Campania (24%) and Abruzzo-Molise (22%). Southern un-

cultivated productive lands were 17% of the national data, than distributed among simple (20%) and with woody plants (13%), while considering compartments those with major unproductive surfaces, related to southern data, were Calabria (33%) and Abruzzo-Molise (25). Considering instead the extension of the simple uncultivated productive land of the south and of each compartment, the major surface was in Abruzzo-Molise (28%) and Calabria (24%), as well as the one with woody plants (respectively 19% and 52%). Regarding arable crops, 26% of their national surface was in the south, while in relation to southern data among compartments it prevailed in Puglia (26%) and Abruzzo-Molise (20%). In detail, cereal areas in the south were 29% of those of the kingdom, the greater extension was in Puglia (26%) and Abruzzo-Molise (26%), while southern arable land with industrial cultivation, that representing 18% of those of the kingdom, had a greater extension in Campania (51%) and Puglia (36%). Southern surfaces with other cultivations on the arable land, that represent 35% of those of the kingdom, prevailed in Abruzzo-Molise (26%), Puglia (24%) and Campania (23%). Southern arable land with forage, 13% of those in the kingdom, was mostly widespread in Abruzzo-Molise (49%), followed by Campania (19%), while southern arable fallow land, with or without pasture, was 31% of those of the kingdom and was more extended in Puglia (40%) and Calabria (28%). Overall these southern alternate arable lands, 26% of those of the related areas, were more extensive in Puglia (27%) and Abruzzo-Molise (26%), while the southern permanent arable cultivation, amounting to 27% of the relative surface of the kingdom, was mainly present in Campania (27%), Puglia (25%) and Abruzzo-Molise (24%). In southern Italy, there was 47% of the woody plant surface of the kingdom divided into different types of cultivation: specialized integral culture in which the cultivation was predominant on the surface; repeated culture in which woody cultivation was not predominant but in association with other woody plants; repeated promiscuous culture in which cultivation of woody plants was in

association with different types of crops. Compared to the total area cultivated with woody plants of the kingdom in the various forms, the southern specialized integral cultivation was divided into 23% olive groves, 6% orchards, 14% vineyards and 1% citrus groves, followed by minimum percentages of mulberry groves, ornamental plants and other woody plants. In southern Italy, surfaces with repeated cultivation associated with other woody plants, compared to the total national data of woody culture, were divided into 16% orchards, 7% olive groves, 2% vineyards and other woody crops, and 1% mulberry groves. The promiscuous was another type of woody cultivation surface on which woody plants were cultivated along with other different cultures, not necessarily woody. This type of cultivation in the south, compared to the total data of woody cultivation surface of the kingdom, was divided into 34% other woody cultures, 20% orchards, 17% olive groves, 9% vineyards and 3% mulberry groves. In the south, surfaces by kind of woody specialized integral cultivation, compared to the national data of the same cultivation, accounted for 64% olive groves, 50% mulberry groves, 46% orchards, 34% vineyards, 30% nurseries, 27% citrus groves and 5% ornamental plants. In the south, the surface of woody repeated cultivation in association with other woody plants, was 70% citrus groves, 55% olive groves, 53% orchards, 49% vineyards, 41% mulberry groves and 38% other woody plants, compared to the national data relating to each type of cultivation. Finally, in the south the surface of woody repeated promiscuous cultivation in association with other non woody cultures, compared to surface with the same type of cultivation of the kingdom, there was 37% olives groves, 33% citrus groves, 20% orchards, 12% other woody cultivation, 7% vineyards and 3% mulberry groves. Considering instead the data only related to the south, the main surface with specialized integral cultivation was olive groves (50%) followed by vineyards (30%), instead considering the repeated surface with woody cultivation, a greater extension had orchards (34%) and olive groves (19%), while the repeated surface with promis-

cuous cultivation had greater extension of orchards (42%), olive groves (37%), vineyards (19%) and others (73%). The land register, recording integral and repeated surfaces, repeated the same extensions several times and in this way allows us to seize the level of promiscuity of the southern woody cultivation. Considering total values of specialized integral cultivation these accounted for more than 100% of the entire southern surface with woody cultivations and around 47% of the same national one. The surface repeated with woody plants accounted for 59% of those in the south and 28% of those of the kingdom, while the southern repeated surface with promiscuous woody cultivation was 188.41% of those of the south and 87.78% of those of the kingdom. This data clearly shows that in southern Italy promiscuous and specialized integral cultivations were widespread, used together, the first equal to four fifths of promiscuous extensions of the kingdom and the second almost half of the national specialized integral surface, while the southern repeated extensions with woody plants were about a quarter of those of the kingdom. Finally considering southern compartments in relation to total extensions by type of culture those with more specialized surface of vineyards were Puglia (48%) Abruzzo-Molise (19%) and Campania (16%). Vineyards cultivated on repeated surface with woody plants were widespread in Puglia (50%) and Calabria (33%), while vineyards in promiscuous cultivation were especially widespread in Campania (78%). Specialized olive groves were present in Puglia (55%) and Calabria (28%), olive groves cultivated with woody plants were widespread in Puglia (70%), those in promiscuous cultivation were in Abruzzo-Molise (40%) and Campania (23%). Olive groves scattered and cultivated in tare [9] were only in Abruzzo-Molise (95%). Specialized citrus groves predominated in Calabria (69%) and Campania (23%), those cultivated with other woody plants were widespread in

[9] With the term “Tare” the land register means small extensions of unused land for cultivation like ditches, farm paths, walls, hedges and similar, even “Tare” can be productive or unproductive.

Campania (35%), Puglia (31%) and Lucania (24%). Those in promiscuous cultivation were more common in Calabria (35%) and Puglia (32%), while scattered citrus groves and those cultivated in tare were present only in Calabria. Specialized mulberry groves culture instead were present only in Calabria (99%), those cultivated with woody plants were present in Calabria (68%), Campania (16%) and Puglia (15%). Those in promiscuous cultivation were widespread in Abruzzo-Molise (52%) and Calabria (33%), while those scattered and in tare were present in Abruzzo-Molise (82%) and Campania (18%). Specialized orchards surfaces were mainly present in Puglia (72%) and Campania (14%), those with other woody plants were also present in Puglia (64%) and Calabria (15%). Orchards in promiscuous cultivations were mainly in Campania (36%) and Abruzzo-Molise (29%), while scattered and in tare orchards surfaces were more widespread in Abruzzo-Molise (71%) and Campania (23%). The particular cultivation of ornamental woody plants was mainly in specialized integral cultivation in Campania (74%) and in promiscuous culture in Puglia (62%). Other types of woody cultures were also present in specialized cultivation in Campania (48%) and Calabria (47%), in promiscuous cultivation equally divided into five compartments, while other types of woody cultures scattered or in tare were widespread in Abruzzo-Molise (68%). This brief reconstruction of the southern Italian agrarian structure, extracted from the land register of 1929, clearly explains the internal articulation not only from a demographic and settlement point of view, but also from the point of view of the productive division of farms, standing out above all the widespread presence of direct conductors and, only in some areas, of agricultural day laborers. But considering the cultures extension, the land register (which also presents data on the number of animals bred), shows that in addition to the arable land and pastures, southern Italy was also characterized, productively and in terms of landscape, by the widespread presence of woody cultivation, not only specialized but also in promiscuous cultures. Therefore, southern Italy which,

despite its historical backwardness, was already showing some inevitable signs of change taking place that would take the south to the threshold of the Italian republic, fully characterized by a property which was widespread and directly cultivated [10].

[10] See *Italian historical rural landscapes: cultural values for the environment and rural development*, a cura di M. Agnoletti, Dordrecht-Heidelberg-London-New York, Springer, 2012; *Mezzogiorno-agricoltura: processi storici e prospettive di sviluppo nello spazio Euromediterraneo*, a cura di F. Bencardino, V. Ferrandino e G. Marotta, Milano, F. Angeli, 2011; D. Grigg, *La dinamica del mutamento in agricoltura*, Bologna, Il mulino, 1985; A. Staderini, *La politica cerealicola del regime: l'impostazione della battaglia del grano*, in "Storia contemporanea", IX, 1978, 5-6, pp. 1027-1079: A. Careddu, S. Lepre, F. Socrate, *Ristagno e sviluppo dell'agricoltura italiana 1918-1939*, in "Quaderni storici", X, 1975, 29-30, pp. 497-518; E. Fano, *L'agricoltura italiana fra le due guerre*, ivi, pp. 468-496; P. Corner, *Considerazioni sull'agricoltura capitalistica durante il fascismo*, ivi, pp. 519-529; G. Tattara, *Cerealicoltura e politica agraria durante il fascismo*, in *Lo sviluppo economico italiano 1861-1940*, a cura di G. Toniolo, Roma-Bari, Laterza, 1973, pp. 373-404; S. Lupo, *Il giardino degli aranci. Il mondo degli agrumi nella storia del Mezzogiorno*, Venezia, Marsilio, 1990; N. Calice, *La politica agraria fascista in Basilicata*, in "Studi storici", II, 1978, pp. 397-421; F. Assante, *Per una storia dell'agricoltura campana nell'età contemporanea*, in *Atti del Convegno nazionale di studi sul rilancio dell'agricoltura italiana, nel III centenario della nascita di Sallustio Bandini, Siena, 15-16 dicembre 1977*, Siena, Monte dei Paschi, 1979, pp. 376-391; M. Marini, G. Capano, *Le trasformazioni dell'agricoltura nella Calabria contemporanea*, in *La Calabria moderna e contemporanea, età presente, approfondimenti*, a cura di A. Placanica, Roma, Gangemi, 1997, pp. XX; G. Colombo, *L'agricoltura della Puglia nel XX secolo*, Corigliano Calabro, Meridiana, 2001; P. Bevilacqua, *Le campagne nel Mezzogiorno tra fascismo e dopoguerra, il caso della Calabria*, Torino, Einaudi, 1980.

Table 1 *Surfaces, population, agricultural households and farms of southern compartments*

| Compartments | Surface | Present inhabitants | Agricultural households | Components | Farms | Farm extension | Surface | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Agricultural | Unproductive |
| Abbruzzo-Molise | 1.541.211 | 1.498.559 | 211.445 | 1.036.693 | 228.275 | 1.298.144 | 1.457.774 | 83.437 |
| Campania | 1.350.699 | 3.494.726 | 1.412.745 | 1.412.745 | 294.541 | 1.125.727 | 1.283.158 | 67.541 |
| Puglia | 1.927.323 | 2.486.593 | 296.370 | 1.306.904 | 282.950 | 1.643.815 | 1.855.306 | 72.017 |
| Lucania | 998.731 | 507.750 | 78.555 | 341.296 | 81.850 | 827.897 | 950.700 | 48.031 |
| Calabria | 1.508.101 | 1.668.954 | 233.298 | 1.026.626 | 216.471 | 1.284.828 | 1.407.947 | 100.154 |
| Southern Italy | 7.326.065 | 9.656.582 | 2.232.413 | 5.124.264 | 1.104.087 | 6.180.411 | 6.954.885 | 371.180 |
| Italy | 31.008.232 | 41.176.671 | 3.908.777 | 19.713.898 | 4.196.266 | 26.251.744 | 28.538.640 | 2.469.592 |

Table 2 *Agricultural households*

| Compartments | Direct conductors | Renters | Settlers | Day laborers | Other agricultural workers | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Abbruzzo-Molise | 124.465 | 19.410 | 26.844 | 35.667 | 5.059 | 211.445 |
| Campania | 115.991 | 76.869 | 16.926 | 78.190 | 13.314 | 301.290 |
| Puglia | 82.806 | 28.794 | 18.015 | 149.506 | 17.249 | 296.370 |
| Lucania | 29.977 | 14.138 | 4.063 | 22.638 | 7.739 | 78.555 |
| Calabria | 66.751 | 20.541 | 31.077 | 94.894 | 20.030 | 233.293 |
| Southern Italy | 419.990 | 159.752 | 96.925 | 380.895 | 63.391 | 1.120.953 |
| Italy | 1.537.862 | 423.373 | 587.506 | 1.069.949 | 290.087 | 3.908.777 |

Table 3 *Percentages of southern farms by number and extension in relation to agricultural and forest surfaces of single compartments*

| Compartments | 0-1 Ha | | 1-5 Ha | | 5-10 Ha | | 10-20 Ha | | 20-50 Ha | | 50-100 Ha | | 100-500 Ha | | 500 Ha | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % n | Ha | % n | Ha | % n | Ha | % n | Ha | % n | Ha | % n | Ha | % n | Ha | % n | Ha |
| Abbruzzo-Molise | 25,23 | 2% | 54,41 | 22% | 14,09 | 15% | 4.74 | 10% | 1,18 | 5% | 0,15 | 2% | 0,11 | 4% | 0,09 | 28% |
| Campania | 39,90 | 5% | 48,43 | 26% | 7,57 | 12% | 2,64 | 8% | 1,02 | 7% | 0,22 | 4% | 0,17 | 8% | 0,05 | 18% |
| Puglia | 35,58 | 3% | 48,94 | 18% | 8,61 | 9% | 3,26 | 7% | 1,95 | 9% | 0,82 | 9% | 0,77 | 24% | 0,07 | 10% |
| Lucania | 24,62 | 1% | 47,65 | 11% | 15,46 | 9% | 6,55 | 8% | 3,36 | 9% | 1,11 | 7% | 1,05 | 19% | 0,21 | 24% |
| Calabria | 44,01 | 3% | 42,75 | 16% | 7,23 | 8% | 3,17 | 7% | 1,59 | 8% | 0,56 | 6% | 0,56 | 19% | 0,13 | 24% |
| Southern Italy | 35,43 | 3% | 48,63 | 19% | 9,70 | 11% | 3,63 | 8% | 1,58 | 8% | 0,49 | 6% | 0,45 | 15% | 0,09 | 20% |

Table 4 *Percentages of southern farms by number and extension in relation to the type of conduction in southern compartments*

| Compartmets | Direct economy | | Rented | | Settled | | Mixed | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Farm | Ha | Farm | Ha | Farm | Ha | Farm | Ha | Farm | Ha |
| Abbruzzo-Molise | 12% | 14% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 5% | 4% | 21% | 21% |
| Campania | 14% | 11% | 6% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 6% | 4% | 27% | 18% |
| Puglia | 15% | 13% | 3% | 6% | 2% | 2% | 5% | 7% | 26% | 27% |
| Lucania | 4% | 7% | 1% | 2% | 0,18% | 0,37% | 2% | 3% | 7% | 13% |
| Calabria | 13% | 14% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 3% | 20% | 21% |
| Southern Italy | 59% | 59% | 13% | 14% | 8% | 6% | 20% | 21% | 100% | 100% |

Table 5 *Total cultures in relation to the southern data*

| Compartmets | Arable | Grassland | Grassland-pastures | Pastures | Specialized woody | Forest | Uncultivated productive |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Abbruzzo-Molise | 25% | 35% | 32% | 18% | 8% | 22% | 25% |
| Campania | 20% | 50% | 49% | 14% | 13% | 24% | 16% |
| Puglia | 26% | 0% | 0% | 27% | 54% | 6% | 12% |
| Lucania | 14% | 10% | 10% | 25% | 3% | 12% | 14% |
| Calabria | 15% | 4% | 8% | 16% | 21% | 36% | 33% |
| Southern Italy | 26% | 2% | 11% | 26% | 47% | 19% | 17% |

Table 6 *Simple cultures in relation to the total southern data*

| Compartmets | Arable | Grassland | Grassland-pastures | Pastures | Uncultivated productive | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Abbruzzo-Molise | 23% | 39% | 33% | 23% | 28% | 23% |
| Campania | 16% | 46% | 49% | 12% | 18% | 16% |
| Puglia | 31% | 0% | 0% | 29% | 12% | 29% |
| Lucania | 16% | 11% | 10% | 19% | 18% | 17% |
| Calabria | 14% | 5% | 8% | 17% | 24% | 15% |
| Southern Italy | 33% | 2% | 15% | 23% | 20% | 20% |

Table 7 *Culture with woody plants in relation to the total southern data*

| Compartmets | Arable | Grassland | Grassland-pastures | Pastures | Uncultivated productive | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Abbruzzo-Molise | 34% | 3% | 11% | 7% | 19% | 18% |
| Campania | 33% | 94% | 58% | 16% | 11% | 21% |
| Puglia | 10% | 0% | 0% | 25% | 11% | 24% |
| Lucania | 4% | 3% | 27% | 38% | 7% | 10% |
| Calabria | 19% | 0,2% | 4% | 15% | 52% | 26% |
| Southern Italy | 14% | 1% | 1% | 33% | 13% | 22% |

Table 8 *Percentages of the surface of each woody cultivation in southern compartments related to the total southern surface with woody cultures*

| Type of cultivation | Abbruzzo-Molise | Campania | Puglia | Lucania | Calabria |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vineyard specialized integral | 19,38% | 16,27% | 47,56% | 4,44% | 12,35% |
| Vineyard repeated with woody plants | 0,26% | 16,9629% | 49,76% | 0,21% | 32,8% |
| Vineyard repeated promiscuous | 15,51% | 78,1% | 0,40% | 0,76% | 5,22% |
| Olive groves specialized integral | 2,73% | 10,94% | 55,42% | 3,35% | 27,56% |
| Olive groves repeated with woody plants | 10,07% | 7,09% | 70,34% | 3,08% | 9,43% |
| Olive groves repeated promiscuous | 39,69% | 22,66% | 15,01% | 3,81% | 18,82% |
| Olive groves repeated scattered and in tare | 94,59% | 1,74% | 0% | 0% | 3,68% |
| Citrus groves specialized integral | 0,21% | 22,62% | 6,45% | 1,29% | 69,44% |
| Citrus groves repeated with woody plants | 0% | 34,86% | 31,44% | 24,23% | 9,47% |
| Citrus groves repeated promiscuous | 1,37% | 13,71% | 32,26% | 18,12% | 34,53% |
| Mulberry groves specialized integral | 0,59% | 0,10% | 0% | 0% | 99,32% |
| Mulberry groves repeated with woody plants | 1,28% | 16,47% | 14,59% | 0% | 67,66% |
| Mulberry groves repeated promiscuous | 52,22% | 13,18% | 1,14% | 0,59% | 32,87% |
| Mulberry groves repeated scattered and in tare | 81,92% | 18,05% | 0% | 0% | 0,03% |
| Orchards specialized integral | 0,95% | 14,21% | 71,83% | 0,44% | 12,57% |
| Orchards repeated with woody plants | 6,57% | 12,14% | 64,30% | 2% | 14,99% |
| Orchards repeated promiscuous | 28,87% | 36,13% | 12,17% | 3,69% | 19,15% |
| Orchards repeated scattered and in tare | 71,19% | 22,68% | 1,34% | 0% | 4,79% |
| Ornamental plants specialized integral | 4,35% | 73,91% | 0% | 0% | 21,74% |
| Ornalental plants repeated promiscuous | 0% | 0% | 62,5% | 0% | 37,5% |
| Other cultivations repeated with woody plants | 5,63% | 47,67% | 0% | 0% | 46,7% |
| Other cultivations repeated promiscuous | 20,46% | 22,38% | 14,44% | 22,05% | 20,67% |
| Other cultivations repeated scattered and in tare | 37,64% | 55,48% | 1,01% | 0,01% | 5,86% |
| Nurseries, groves of reeds, etc. specialized integral | 67,81% | 6,21% | 9,89% | 7,39% | 8,7% |
| Tare specialized integral | 5,82% | 16,53% | 51,15% | 4,05% | 22,46% |

Table 9 *Percentages of southern surface of each woody culture related to the national total surface with woody cultures, to the national surface of each kind of woody cultivation and to the total southern surface with woody cultures*

| Type of cultivation | Percentages of the southern surface compared to total national surface of woody cultures | Percentages of the southern surface compared to the national surface of the same woody cultures | Percentages of the southern surface compared to total surface of the southern woody cultures |
|---|---|---|---|
| Vineyard specialized integral | 14,08% | 34,31% | 30,23% |
| Vineyard repeated with woody plants | 1,73% | 48,89 | 3,71% |
| Vineyard repeated promiscuous | 9,02% | 7,11% | 19,36% |
| Olive groves specialized integral | 23,1% | 64,43% | 49,59% |
| Olive groves repeated with woody plants | 7,06% | 54,81% | 15,16% |
| Olive groves repeated promiscuous | 17,16% | 36,89% | 36,84% |
| Olive groves repeated scattered and in tare | 0,09% | 5,51% | 0,19% |
| Citrus groves specialized integral | 0,67% | 27,18% | 1,44% |
| Citrus groves repeated with woody plants | 0,26% | 69,57% | 0,57% |
| Citrus groves repeated promiscuous | 0,21% | 33,03% | 0,44% |
| Citrus groves repeated scattered and in tare | 0% | 1,81% | 0% |
| Mulberry groves specialized integral | 0,18% | 50,32% | 0,38% |
| Mulberry groves repeated with woody plants | 1,06% | 41,31% | 2,27% |
| Mulberry groves repeated promiscuous | 3,25% | 3,41% | 6,98% |
| Mulberry groves repeated scattered and in tare | 0,89% | 5,28% | 1,92% |
| Orchards specialized integral | 6,44% | 45,83% | 13,83% |
| Orchards repeated with woody plants | 15,77% | 53,41% | 33,86% |
| Orchards repeated promiscuous | 19,51% | 20,17% | 41,89% |
| Orchards repeated scattered and in tare | 2,24% | 10,05% | 4,8% |
| Other cultivations repeated with woody plants | 1,71% | 37,55% | 3,68% |
| Other cultivations repeated promiscuous | 33,98% | 21,62 | 72,93% |
| Other cultivations repeated scattered and in tare | 3,24% | 12,29% | 6,95% |
| Nurseries, groves of reeds, etc. specialized integral | 0,29% | 29,83% | 0,62% |
| Tare specialized integral | 1,82% | 42,32% | 3,9% |

**Gaetano Morese**

Dottore di ricerca in Storia dell Europa mediterranea dall antichità all età contemporanea dell Università degli studi della Basilicata, collabora con la cattedra di Storia contemporanea della stessa università. Socio della Sissco, dell Associazione per la storia sociale del Mezzogiorno e dell area mediterranea e della Deputazione lucana di storia patria, ha al suo attivo numerose pubblicazioni fra monografie e saggi sulla storia economica, del paesaggio agrario, delle classi dirigenti e in generale sulla dinamica storico-sociale fra ' 700 e '900, con particolare attenzione alla realtà meridionale.