Bio-cultural Heritage and Communities of Practice. Participatory Processes in Territorial Development as a Multidisciplinary Fieldwork.

Letizia Bindi

1. A Multidisciplinary Fieldwork

Research projects and educational programs are increasingly insisting on multidisciplinary clusters applied to new fieldworks or to more classic issues and debates, revised through new lens and approaches.

In this volume we aim at debating, through concrete case studies and good practices, researches and educational examples, new empiric and critical conceptualizations of local and community-based sustainable development in the rural context.

The most part of the contributors to the issue are anthropologists, geographers, and rural sociologists presently doing ethnographies in the countryside and with rural and peasant communities, particularly focusing on processes of heritagization of rurality (Roigé-Frigolé, 2010; Watson, Waterton, 2010; Della Torre, 2013; Paniagua, 2014; Guan-Jun-Chaozhi, 2019), on interactions between local communities and public policies – EU as well as National and Regional programs (i.e. LEADER approach, CAP, specific regional programs and strategies), practicing a challenging cooperation with other disciplines and scholars like rural economists, agrarians, environmentalists, zoologists, political scientists and so on (Labianca, 2021; Müller-Sutter-Wohlgemouth, 2019, 2020).

The objective of this work is discussing and redefining - through empiric and critical ethnographic cases, tools and methodologies as well as a constructive framework - the idea of territorial and rural development in the last two decades, with especial, but not exclusive reference to the

European local agriculture, neo-endogenous local development and "new peasantries", didactical and social agriculture and rural activities, short supply chains, food embeddedness in the terroir and symbolic roots of rurality as an added value in the relative food, handcraft and tourism markets.

Among the different types of approach to rural and territorial development in the context of local and supralocal cooperation, we can count:

• An instrumental approach: in which experts (among others anthropologists) are committed in development processes as "applied" researchers, consultants, again as bureaucrats, although the forms of concrete action of aid and support change a lot over time. Intervention (Davidson-Hunt et al., 2012).

• A 'populist' approach: a model of "alternative development" that exalts indigenous knowledge and local skills, diminishing the value of expert and scientific knowledge as structurally more 'extractive' and decontextualized from that of the communities to which it is opposes a largely 'participatory' approach, from the bottom up (Thompson – Scoones, 1994; Mamonova-Franquesa, 2020)

• A critical / deconstructive approach: which analyzes development processes as discourses and representations, as a system of knowledge, practices, technologies, power relations that order and control the ideas, processes and trends of rural development and territorial connected with colonial and post-colonial processes and of national control over the wishes of local territories (Ferguson, 1994; Escobar, 1995; Ferguson – Gupta, 2002).

The steps and actions used to carry out this reflection and critical evaluation of the territorial rural development processes are articulated in different stages and modalities:

1.   Observation of the actors,

2.   Ethnographic understanding of the 'social life' of development projects from their conception to their implementation and realization, as well as the responses and concrete experiences of the different social

actors (Long – Lng, 1992; Long, 2001, pp. 14 -15) and the observation of how local, regional and national development institutions work differently (Lewis, 1998; Lewis et., 2003),

3.   Definition of intermediary actors understood as "brockers" for the communities, that is, as "interfaces" between different worldviews and knowledge systems (Mosse, 2005a, 2005b; Olivier de Sardan, 2004).

The brokerage system in development processes becomes necessary when a fragile State or political authority partially or totally fails to impose its ratio in local regions and recruits subordinate relationships to obtain a better effectiveness in the control of territories.

The 'brokers of development' are therefore intermediaries between institutions and peasant communities: they can be ambivalent figures, in reality, perhaps emanating from civil society as in other cases agents of an instrumental idea of aid and cooperation. In this type of analysis, we find the risk of a self-justifying system (Olivier de Sardan, 2004) demonstrating the need for external figures of territorial development who themselves uphold the animating principles of their involvement in the processes.

In the most positive and equal reading of development brockers, we can think of these figures of intermediaries as translators of cooperation codes who make a mutual commitment in development processes and intertwining of interests that produce project realities.

The recent reconfiguration of the rural Europe is encompassed in more complex social forms than before: it has to deal with the effects of globalization in the countryside, the demographic change, the role of State and bureaucracy, new social actors and markets embedded in the fieldwork, new super-national orders like EU-frameworks confronted to the local dimensions, new challenges confronted to climate changes issues and increasing pollution problems.

This has considerably rescaled the ethnographic fieldwork and object of research (Faubion, Marcus, 2009), redefining the idea of local cultural heritage and identity and a new European rural imagery as well as the notion of development, which has been historically crucial for

anthropological studies in dynamic dialogue with all the other concerned scientific approaches (Wolf, 1956-71; Roe, 1994).

The issue has a strong multi-disciplinary and pluri-language accent, oriented towards a transversal, multifocal and multi-situated vision and perspective on the complex and multi-faceted definition of the rural and sustainable development and the link territorial enhancement has with bio-cultural heritage issues such as traditions, kinship and social relationships, sense of belongingness to space, territories and landscape, human/animal relationships.

2. Bio-Cultural Heritage at stake

It may be appropriate to define the notion of bio-cultural heritage and the way in which it interacts and impacts with the processes of rural and territorial development.

The debate on bio-cultural heritage arises in the context of the political discourse on the right to the recognition of the specificities of the practices and knowledge of a given territory and landscape, fueled in the first place by the battles of the natives in the various post-colonial contexts and especially in the specific context of the Latin-American indigenous communities that have suffered from the seventeenth century onwards, and with an important acceleration since the second half of the nineteenth century, a systematic depredation of their resources, a logic of extractive economic growth, indifferent to any social or environmental warning.

In this context, fighting for native self-determination rights has meant, from a certain moment onwards, to work alongside the communities in a process of empowerment based on awareness and bio-cultural memory, on the sharing and transmission of knowledge and practices that had progressively cracked or deconstructed, on the enhancement of products connected to local communities and forms of craftsmanship or agriculture based on tradition.

In this sense, the heritage issue is political and at the same time cultural, inextricably linked to memory, to the awareness of what has historically been a common cultural orientation, to the ability to rearticulate, in the present, a sense of belonging to places and yet at the same time different forms, even very innovative ones which also contribute to the consolidation of the social bond of belonging of individuals to places and to a complex and controversial concept of community.

The native processes of claiming cultural property have largely passed through the safeguarding, custody and sharing of knowledge and practices aimed at the well-being of the community: through the forms of physical and mental care of its members, through the production of healthy and necessary for the development of the bodies and the maintenance of health, for the full expression of their shared emotions and beliefs as well as for the delicate management of moments of emptying and pain, essentially represented by losses, disasters and conflicts. It was only very late, in native contexts, that cultural property was connected to its enhancement.

Enhancing the environmental and cultural heritage of a given territorial and community reality introduces in the spectrum of cultural processes and practices a new and complex element, precisely that of value, an ambivalent notion, connected to the recognition of the importance that a given practice or knowledge have for local communities, but on the other hand also the more strictly economic and commodified notion of tangible and intangible cultural heritage to which decades of engineering of culture and of tourism enhancement projects of heritage sites and events have accustomed us (Comaroff, Comaroff, 2009; Coombe – Aylwin, 2011).

In the specific case of bio-cultural heritage in the rural dimension, an important theme is represented by the processes of enhancing and safeguarding cultural landscapes and historical rural sites as well as collections scattered throughout the various national territories dedicated to peasant, mountain, artisanal civilization, the inventories of the intangible signs of material culture in the various localities. Each of these repositories of objects, stories, people, but also of natural or cultivated

biodiversity, of wild and farmed animals must be understood as a garrison not only of memory, but also as a repertoire of knowledge rooted in the territory that today are increasingly reconsidered.

On the one hand, the approach and uses of the rural and pastoral past come from a nostalgic posture towards something irremediably lost and which returns in its form of memory trace, often reified, sweetened and spectacularized (Krupar, 2019).

On the other hand, some of these knowledge and practices of the agro-pastoral world are now useful to make certain crops or forms of farming less impactful and more sustainable, for the wise and thrifty use of resources - water, land, woods, etc. - available to humans and animals in the same territory, for a more balanced capacity for coexistence between environment, socio-cultural and productive practices, between traditional uses of spaces and soil and innovative and sustainable ways of rethinking those same practices and adapt them to the present.

In the 'extractive' system of the agro-industry, the territories are treated as spaces devoid of characterization and "sense of places": they lose their identity characterization, the cultural relations managing social division of labor, the internal organization of the various activities within the communities, the transmission from generation to generation. In this way, agricultural, pastoral and artisan knowledge are gradually eliminated, contributing to the formation of new places and landscapes, to a dramatically transformed territory.

In this sense, dealing with bio-cultural heritage in a rural context requires new methodologies and the increase of multidisciplinary fields of investigation that make it possible to observe the transition processes and well as environmental, social and political frictions, the multiple coexistences of different scales that we will see at work in this volume through specific case studies.

In such ethnographic and multidisciplinary cases we can observe dynamics and transformations, changes and tensions from which territories and communities - rural as well as urban ones, as long as such a

narrow dichotomy is still valid today - are punctually crossed (Marmol, Vaccaro, 2015).

For example, the issue of the conservation of environmental and biological biodiversity immediately implies the question of protected areas and their genesis and management: it poses important choices - what to protect? What to enhance? what to replant? Why choose this or that native cultivation or breed?

It is never a neutral choice, a purely ecological data: each choice is immediately political, intertwines with different levels of governance and actors: local policy-makers, environmentalists, experts and researchers somehow invited or called to deal with territorial issues, planners who deal with supralocal and supranational financing, but also companies operating in the territory that are seen more or less facilitated or threatened by the establishment of a park or reserve, which are more or less benefited by the agricultural or breeding specialization of a certain area (Maffi, 2005; Wolverton et al., 2014; Cock, Wiersum, 2014; Gavin et al., 2015; Eriksson, 2018).

In the Latin American context, the notion and practice of safeguarding bio-cultural heritages mostly translates into the conservation or rediscovery of the ancestral (native) and traditional (in the Latin American context, ancient, but not exclusively native) uses of medicinal plants, which not surprisingly have been themselves heavily extracted by European pharmaceutical companies, but also of foods and traditional forms of processing food that have subsequently been widely commercialized and globalized by the large international food industry, feeding new and old social and economic asymmetries, permanent subalternities, new forms of an ancient colonial system of controlling native people through an effective imposition of a global system of domination (Gupta – Ferguson, 1992, p. 17).

Therefore, dealing with bio-cultural heritage imposes a reflection on the politics of claims, on movements of self-determination, but also on the interactions and uses of the past in the processes of local development. Common goods and the concerned conflicts about their control and the

appropriation - material and symbolic - of territories and bio-cultural heritage as well as of natural resources, constitute an articulated scientific field at the cross among social sciences, economic and political issues as well as ecological implications guiding the agenda of sustainability.

Bio-cultural diversity inserts an element of discontinuity within the agricultural space and landscape due to the specificity historically originated and consolidated and determining the landscape producing such a progressive genetic and linguistic specialization and differentiation of crops and landscapes, increasingly refined categorizations of different vegetable and animal species and of the forms and codifications of their cultivation and breeding practices (Braaksma et al., 2016).

In traditional contexts conserving biodiversity has to do with a harmonious relationship with ecosystems, which respects their times and methods of production and the embedded memory of traditional knowledge of cultivation and breeding (Olick and Robbins, 1998; Toledo, Barrera-Bassols, 2009; Grasseni, 2003), the knowledge of the hand) at various degrees of resolution: a) geographical, that is, connected with state or regulatory units of recognition; b) ecological, which refers to a much larger area shared by similar climatic and territorial conditions.

At the same time, the linguistic biodiversity connected to the different agricultural and pastoral traditions determines a variety of idioms, conventional and intimate expressions. In this sense is relevant that different geographical areas of the world in which the level of cultivated and bred biodiversity is greater (many varieties, species, methods of cultivation and breeding), are also those with greater variety, are also those that express the presence of the greatest number of languages and forms of linguistic and therefore cultural variety. At the same time, the link between the end of the traditional agricultural and pastoral worlds in certain areas and the definitive extinction of the languages they speak, due to the abandonment or end of the ethno-linguistic group itself, is very relevant.

The progressive growth of mono-crops, typical of a certain 'extractive' industry - in the explicit sense, in one case, of a mining industry and in the

metaphorical sense, on the other, of an agro-industrial system aimed only at maximizing profits at an evident risk of strong environmental impact and socially at the local level - coincides with a loss of agro-diversity, of cultivated and farmed biodiversity and of the concerned bio-cultural heritage.

This is evidently at the origin of several environmental, social and cultural frictions accumulated in recent decades around the delicate interaction between agricultural vocations of the various territories and individual communities and processes of growing agri-food standardization both in terms of production and consumption.

From this point of view, three questions are of particular interest for the analysis of these processes:

- how can the plurality of agricultural and pastoral knowledge and practices and the different rurality models / landscapes be preserved?

- How are the various actors and rural communities carrying these elements that are in some ways resistant - some speak of resilience - protected from the standardization associated with agro-industry?

The growing eco-frictions resulting from an irresponsible use of resources are in fact connected in an increasingly systematic way to inequalities in access to good quality food, in the indiscriminate use of pesticides, antibiotics in the case of farms, with a serious threat to health that derive precisely from the persistence of intensive agriculture (Tsing, 2004; Benadusi, 2015; MacRae, 2016).

Starting from an ethnocentric idea of slave exploitation - in agriculture as in the mining industry - of colonized or submissive populations anthropocentric of the control and exploitation of natural resources, an era of large multinationals and monocultures typical of the "Capitalocene", we have moved on to a narrative dominant ethnocentric impact and human control of the environment and animals that today is associated with the critical notion of "Anthropocene" (Haraway, 2016; Moore, 2016).

At the same time, the large global bodies responsible for food security and the food rights of the world population, launch programs for a new green transition aiming at food and nutritional security through an adequate

balance between national production and marketing, setting up legal frameworks for an adequate nutrition even for people producing food who, today, are often denied of their own food rights.

Several activists are strongly claiming for the importance of traditional knowledge and practices to maintain healthy ecosystems alongside new scientific discoveries in the field of prevention and environmental protection: a complex of elements that are defined by many today through the articulated notion of "food citizenship" (Welsh, Rae 2011; Dubuisson-Queiller et al., 2011).

When the model applied to agriculture is globalized, a global system of domination is imposed (Gupta and Ferguson, 1992, p. 17) and the territories are deprived of a 'sense of place', of identity characterization, of cultural relations managing the social division of labor and the transmission of traditional knowledge-practice systems from generation to generation.

Fighting against the increasing estrangement from nature through a renewed ecological commitment and participatory democracy means, then, 1) promoting inclusion processes through social agriculture, socio-environmental alliances for a fundamental agricultural economy, engaged in recycling, reuse of resources, economic circularity, short supply chain of agri-food products; 2) contrasting the media and new media complicity on ideological assumptions, based on a late-positivist rhetoric supported by populist arguments; 3) dismantling the idea of an agriculture based on unstoppable growth, recovering a conception of nature and the environment as subjects of law, deserving of respect and protection, limits. Such an opposition is between a model of agro-pastoral industry conveying in a concept of "monoculture of the mind" (Shiva, 1993), made up of loss of biodiversity and conflict between large-scale distribution and small farmers and shepherds attentive to social and environmental sustainability, participatory forms of agriculture such as community cooperatives or common goods, experiences of innovation and social inclusion, precision agriculture, new market and responsible consumers' groups. All this is related to the very sensitive issues of migration in the

rural space and in fragile and internal areas: exploitation, inequalities and subordination that are opposed through rural work and social agriculture (Corrado, 2018; Zumpano et al., 2020).

The climatic, financial and political crises that have characterized the last two decades have aggravated an already rather tense situation for Mediterranean rural areas and communities. The territorial polarization that has accompanied the modernization of the agricultural sector has resulted in a growing intensification of production activities in the areas with the greatest potential (lowlands, coastal areas), in parallel with a progressive abandonment of more marginal environments such as mountainous, arid and islands where the potential for agricultural intensification is structurally limited.

The implications for the relative reconfiguration of agro-ecological and socio-economic landscapes have been dramatic. Family farming has become an increasingly less profitable enterprise, while the opportunities and conditions of farm laborers have been compromised by increasing mechanization in areas with greater potential and land abandonment in those with less potential. Although with different rhythms and modalities, these processes have led to a significant displacement of the population out of rural areas. A common feature of most rural communities in the region today is the emigration of rural youth in search of a more promising future elsewhere.

As a result, rural communities and agricultural enterprises are increasingly facing demographic problems and the related implications in terms of job availability and generational turnover: new farmers represent, in this sense, the innovative and dynamic subjects of the territory.

Certain concepts and context seem then non-scalable (Lowenhaupt Tsing, 2012). Scalable projects are those that can be expanded without modifications. Scalability, then, is only possible in absence of transformative relationships that could change the project as the elements are added. Transformative relationships, in fact, are the means for diversity to emerge. Scalable projects eliminate meaningful diversity that could change things.

In the 18th century, large European investors and colonizers came to think of the world as a plantation. They designed governance systems for rural development based on a large colonial plantation model: maximization, non-specialization of workers, standardization of the industrial model of agricultural work, alienating, based on displacement, uprooting and total subordination of the peasant slave or still subordinate. The expansion of the agri-food market was proposed as a linear, univocal, 'extractivist' advancement. Faced with this picture of productivist homogenization, the frictions are "the uncomfortable, unequal, unstable and creative qualities of interconnection by difference" (Lowenhaupt Tsing, 2012). Local groups are opposing the neoliberal violence of scalable development projects and productive growth with models of strong territorialization and non-scalable endogenous development, with experiences of recovery of ancient crops, cultural exchanges and contaminations between natives and migrants not as an apparent intercultural habit, but as a truly regenerative practice and as a circular economy that includes through agricultural practices. Basing on these experiences, non-scalability becomes the theory to re-conceptualize the world, and perhaps to reconstruct it in a better way (Lovenhaupt Tsing, 2012).

Biodiversity is a repertory of potentialities and variants contrasting the standardization of practices and products of intensive agriculture allowing to resist and remain (Teti, 2018). They are opportunities for rethinking different balances among local development, environmental and socio-cultural sustainability, moral economies and participation in decision-making processes (Roessler, 2012).

Nevertheless, there is a tendency to overlap applied and generated policies on a given territorial context which sometimes results in immobility.

On one hand, we observe the prevalence of narratives and sweetened representations of local rural traditions, scarcely and only apparently non-conflictual and therefore quite unlikely of a specific set of secular practices and knowledge.

On the other hand, we face the still very strong prevalence of governmentality and stratified powers against the actual participation of practitioners and heritage-keepers despite constant evocation, at the level of national development programs and global views. 'Participatory rhetoric' seems increasingly necessary for political legitimacy but substantially denied.

This is what we have tried to tackle in this volume through a very varied series of case studies that all focus, however, on the interweaving of safeguarding and enhancing recognizable territorial vocations and sustainable, lasting and participatory processes of local development and regeneration, at least in intention (Sanchez-Carrettero, Jimènez-Esquinas 2016).

The volume is divided into three main sections.

In section I - *Transitions and participatory processes in the territories* - contributions are mainly concentrated on experiences of rural and local development conveyed by specific programs and frameworks of recognizable heritagization and local enhancement.

In Oliver Müller's paper (Ch. I/1), the focus is about participatory rural governance and multiple actors involved in the management of rural natures. The research particularly outlines a LEADER project aiming at the reconstruction of cultural landscapes in a LEADER region in the German federal state North Rhine-Westphalia. "The Green Village" project is focused on the participation of local residents, committed to counteract the loss of biodiversity particularly conceived as 'typical' village species and habitats. This objective is pursued by reinvigorating bio-cultural heritage, i.e. traditional (ecological) knowledge, land-tenure customs, land use systems and practices. The article explores, how in participatory conservation of rural natures, the different perspectives and forms of knowledge of development experts and local residents interact. This allows a specific reflection on the role of multidisciplinary experts as knowledge brokers in rural governance.

In the Cinzia Marchesini and Daniele Parbuono's paper (Ch. I/2), a long-term ethnography has generated a local development project -

"TrasiMemo. Trasimeno memory bank", in the area of Lake Trasimeno (Umbria Region - Italy). Paying particular attention at cultural heritage, especially the craftsmanship of iron, terracotta, wood and textiles, the project has triggered a proactive dialogue between citizens, heritage experts, anthropologists, social and health workers, and local administrators. The aim is to construct policies to combat abandonment of the area, which is at extreme risk of depopulation with the consequent loss of knowledge, practices and landscape features.

In the Pedro Azevedo's contribution on "*The valorization of the Portuguese Inner Way to Santiago de Compostela (CPIS) as a Mechanism for Territorial Development*" (Ch. I/3), the conversion of CPIS into a tourist route, understood as the main result of heritagization initiatives, allows the development of a mostly rural territory and the consequent transformation of this pilgrimage route, as a tourist resource, into a tourist product. Furthermore, it promotes sustainable development based on the promotion and commercialization of endogenous territorial resources.

The Belletti, Ranaboldo, Scarpellini, Gabellini, and Scaramuzzi's, paper (Ch. I/4) focuses on "*Networks and territorial activation as key factors for the valorization of biocultural heritage*". They outline the most important results of the Erasmus + Capacity Building Project 'SUS-TER', aiming at contribut ing to the inclusive and sustainable territorial valorization of local resources, in particular by strengthening human capital, which, as we have seen, is a determining and critical element in the activation and functioning of the virtuous circle. Carried out in 5 countries between Europe and Latin America, the educational offer is oriented to form a profile of rural dynamizer of processes of local empowerment based on the recognition of cultural and natural diversity. Faced with these challenges, methodology is focused on case-studies, multidisciplinarity and participatory research-action. The specific case addressed is the process of rural territorial development in Garfagnana, a rural area in the North of Tuscany. Wladimir Mejia, from Colombia, is centering his contribution on an "*Approach to viticulture in Colombia from tourism and biocultural heritage*" (Ch. I/5). Even if Colombia, in fact, is not one of the

Countries strictly characterized by this agricultural practice, we assisted in the last years to the cultural and mediatic growth on viticulture as the "wine of the Tropics", linked to the development of tourist destinations. The recovery of the rural traditional past ends up representing a new identity and heritage implying the socio-economic dynamization of the region.

The II section of the book is centered on *"Rural sustainable development between tradition and innovation: a focus on pastoralism"*. It is composed by three papers insisting on different case-studies of recuperation and valorization of pastoral and transhumant bio-cultural heritage as a driven for local economy and society revitalization.

Kinga Czerwinska's contribution on *"Contemporary aspects of Pastoralism, between economy and cultural heritage"* (Ch. II/1), with examples from Silesian Beskid Mountains in Poland, examines different representation and strategies involved in developing new forms of rural activities and deeply influencing local communities with a particular attention given to the construction of shepherds' activities as a tourist attraction and as an eco-systemic service. In the process of sharing and exploring heritage for the purposes of cultural tourism, numerous aspects of its essence are revealed: duration/changes, bonding/connecting the past and the future as well as the dynamics inherent in the constructive sense of cultural heritage revealed in the act of taking over and interpreting it to new needs of tourism.

Jacopo Trivisonno's paper *"Voci del Molise: Anthropological Perspectives for participatory development"* (Ch. II/2), a new poetics of Italian Inner Areas is declined between anthropological accounts and new community practices of enhancement and valorization of local biocultural heritage. Shepherds and cheese-makers, old and new peasants are observed in their different activities, in their ambitions of recuperating the past mixing it with new expectations and multifunctionality, in a new, complex interaction between expert systems and innovative competences and proposals of shepherds and farmers according to a process of "re-peasantization" (Van der Ploeg, 2008, p. 360) as a new perspective for rural territories.

On her turn, Ioana Baskerville proposes a focus on "*Romanian Transhumance: from enduring folk mythology to contemporary cultural and biological heritage*" (Ch. II/3). Starting from the 2021 officially engagement of Romania in the process of a multinational extended file for inscription of transhumance in the UNESCO Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage, the paper insists on the collaboration among different disciplines in order to provide a multidisciplinary expert knowledge needed to assess the biological and cultural features of such a knowledge-practice system. Cultural, ecological, and economic values of transhumance are to be considered when proposing safeguarding measures intended to involve this kind of mobile pastoralism in local development strategies, given the multiple threats that this traditional occupation faces in contemporary Romania.

The III Section of the book is centered about "*Creativity and innovation in regeneration of rural and mountainous territories*".

The paper, written by Ivo Povinelli, Roberta Raffaetà, Chiara Dallapé and Lorenzo Baratter (ch. III/1), outlines the economic benefits of large tourist flows and their impact on the livability of the area by sacrificing the environment, local cultures and the quality of life. The paper describes an experimental educational path for the enhancement of the biocultural heritage as a founding moment for communities wishing to make choices about their own destinies. An approach on the borderline between anthropology, community psychology and sociology, which poses the issues of sustainability, quality of life and participation in multidisciplinary terms, in the area of the Ecomuseum of Judicarie in the province of Trento and the Pro Loco Network involved in such a local regeneration process.

Finally, the Letizia Bindi's paper "*Vivace, Largo, Andante, Allegro ma non troppo. Arts and rural regeneration in four movements*" (Ch. III/2) is an inaugural attempt to articulate a specific reflection on a particular aspect of sustainable rural development processes and their connection with biocultural heritage: that of the value of creativity, art and experimentation in social and cultural innovation as levers for a new

cohesion and commitment of local populations in the development project and as a powerful attractor of experiences enabling a permanent fertilization even of very depressed, abandoned and fragile areas through a fruitful interaction between the local population and artists, designers, architects and creatives from the most diverse parts of the world.

The book is concluded by a Giovanni Belletti's Afterword trying to give synthesis and continuity to different contributions approaching the central issue of the book, albeit in a very different way.

References

Benadusi M. (2015), Antropologia dei disastri. Ricerca, Attivismo, Applicazione. Un'introduzione. *Antropologia Pubblica,* I (1/2), pp. 25-46.

Braaksma P.J., Jacobs M.H., van der Zande A.N. (2016), The production of local landscape heritage: A case study in the Netherlands. *Landscape Research*, 41(1), pp. 64–78.

Cocks M.L., Wiersum F. (2014), Reappraising the concept of biocultural diversity: A perspective from South Africa. *Human Ecology,* 42(5): 727–737.

Comaroff J.L., Comaroff J. (2009), *Ethnicity, Inc.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coombe R. J., Aylwin N. (2011), Bordering diversity and desire: using intellectual property to mark place-based products. *Environment and Planning A.,* 43, pp. 2017-2042.

Corrado A. (Ed.) (2018), *Migrazioni e lavoro agricolo in Italia. Le ragioni di una relazione problematica.* Roma: Open Society Foundation.

Davidson-Hunt I., Turner K.L., Pareake Mead A. T., Cabrera-Lopez J., Bolton R., C. Idrobo J., Miretski I., Morrison and Robson J.P. (2012), Biocultural Design: A New Conceptual Framework for Sustainable Development in Rural Indigenous and Local Communities. *S.A.P.I.EN.S.,* 5 (2), pp. 33-45.

del Mármol C, Vaccaro I. (2015), Changing ruralities: Between abandonment and redefinition in the Catalan Pyrenees. *Anthropological Forum,* 25(1), pp. 21–41.

De La Torre, M. (2013), Values and Heritage Conservation. *Heritage & Society*, 60 (2), pp. 155-166.

Dubuisson-Quellier S., Lamine C., Le Velley R. (2011), Citizenship and Consumption: Mobilisation in Alternative Food System in france. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 51(1), pp. 305-323.

Escobar A. (1995), *Encountering Development: The Making and unmaking of the Third World.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Faubion J.D., Marcus G.E. (Eds.) (2009), *Fieldwork is Not Whats is Used to be: Learning Anthropology's Method in Time of Transition.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Ferguson, J. (1994), *The anti-politics machine: Development, depoliticization and bureaucratic power in Lesotho.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ferguson, J., and A. Gupta. (2002), Spatializing states: Towards an ethnography of neoliberal governmentality. *American Ethnologist*, 29(4), pp. 981–1002.

Ferreti V., Comino E. (2015), "An integrated framework to assess complex cultural and natural heritage systems with Multi-Attribute Value Theory". *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 15(5), pp. 688-697.

Frigolé J. – Roigé Ventura X. (Eds.) (2010), *Constructing cultural and natural heritage*. Barcelona: Documenta Universitaria.

Gavin M.C., McCarter J., Mead A., Berkes F., Stepp J.R., Peterson D., Tang R. (2015), Defining biocultural approaches to conservation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30(3), pp. 140–145.

Grasseni C. (2003), *Lo sguardo della mano. Pratiche della località e antropologia della visione in una comunità montana lombarda.* Bergamo: Bergamo University Press.

Guan J., Jun G., and Chaozhi Z. (2019), Food Heritagization and Sustainable Rural Tourism Destination: The Case of China's Yuanjia Village. *Sustainability*, 11 (10), pp. 2858-2873.

Gupta A., Ferguson J. (1992), Beyond "culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1), pp. 6-23.

Haraway D. (2016). Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: Making Kin. *Environmental Humanities*, 6(1), pp. 159-165.

Krupar, S. (2016), The Biopolitics of Spectacle: Salvation and Oversight at the Postmilitary Nature Refuge. In: B. Magnusson and Z. Zalloua (eds). *Global Spectacles*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, pp. 116-153.

Labianca, M. (2021), LEADER: a starting point for review. In: M. Labianca (ed.), Towards a Visionary Approach for rural areas. From the key features to planning the future of LEADER, *Perspectives on rural development*, 5: pp. 19-30.

Lewis, D. (1998), "Partnership as process: Building an institutional ethnography of an inter-agency aquaculture project in Bangladesh". In D. Mosse, J. Farrington, and A. Rew. (eds.), *Development as process: Concepts and methods for working with complexity*, London: Routledge: pp. 99–114.

Lewis, D., Bebbington A., Batterbury S., Shah A., Olson E., Siddiqi M.S., and Duvall S. (2003), Practice, power and meaning: Frameworks for studying organizational culture in multi-agency rural development projects. *Journal of International Development*, 15(5), pp. 541-557.

Long, N. (2001), *Development sociology: Actor perspectives.* London: Routledge.

Long, N., Long A. (eds) (1992), *Battlefields of knowledge: The interlocking of theory and practice in social research and development.* London: Routledge.

Lowenhaupt Tsing A. (2004), *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection.* Princeton. Princeton University Press.

Lowenhaupt Tsing A. (2012), On Non-scalability: The Living World Is Not Amenable to Precision-Nested Scales. *Common Knowledge*, 18(3), pp. 505-524.

MacRae G. (2016), Food Sovereignty and the Anthropology of Food: Ethnographic Approaches to Policy and Practice. *Anthropological Forum. A Journal of Social Anthropology and Comparative Sociology*, 26 (3), pp. 227-232.

Maffi L. (2005), Linguistic, cultural and biological diversity. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29(1), pp. 599–617.

Mamonova N., Franquesa J. (2020), Right-Wing Populism in Rural Europe. Introduction to the Special Issue. *Sociologia Ruralis* (Special Issue: Right-Wing Populism in Rural Europe), 60 (4), pp. 702-709.

Moore J. W. (2016), Anthropocene or Capitalocene? Nature, History, and the Crisis of Capitalism. Oakland. PM Press.

Mosse, D. 2005a. *Cultivating development: An ethnography of aid policy and practice.* London: Pluto Press.

Mosse, D. 2005b. Global governance and the ethnography of international aid. In D. Mosse and D. Lewis (eds.), *The aid effect: Giving and governing in international development,* London: Pluto Press.

Müller, O., Sutter, O.; Wohlgemuth, S. (2019), Translating the Bottom-Up Frame. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 28 (2), pp. 45-65.

Müller, O.; Sutter, O., Wohlgemuth, S. (2020), Learning to LEADER. Ritualised Performances of 'Participation' in Local Arenas of Participatory Rural Governance, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 60 (1), pp. 222-242.

Olick J.K., Robbins J. (1998), Social memory studies: From 'collective memory' to the historical sociology of mnemonic practices. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24(1), pp. 105–140.

Olivier de Sardan, J.P. (2004), *Anthropology and development: Understanding contemporary social change.* London: Zed Books.

Paniagua A. (2014), Rurality, identity and morality in remote rural areas in Northern Spain. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 35, pp. 49-58.

Roe, M.E. (1994), *Narrative policy analysis: Theory and practice.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rossler, M. (2012), "Partners in Site Management a Shift in Focus: Heritage and Community Involvement". In A.Witcomb, M. Albert, M. Viñals, and M. Richon (eds.), *Community Development through World Heritage*, Paris: UNESCO, pp. 27–32.

Sánchez-Carretero, C., Jiménez-Esquinas G. (2016), Relaciones entre actors patrimoniales: gobernanza patrimonial, modelos neoliberales y procesos participativos, *Revista de Philosophia.* 90, pp. 190-197.

Shiva V. (1993), *Monocultures of the Mind. Perspectives on Biodiversity and Biotechnology.* New York. Palgrave Macmillan.

Silva, R., V. Fernández. (2017), El nuevo paradigma del patrimonio y su consideración con los paisajes: Conceptos, métodos y prospectivas. *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica,* 63 (1), pp. 129-151.

Smith, L. (2006), *The uses of heritage.* London: Routledge.

Teti V. (2018), *Quel che resta. L'Italia dei paesi, tra abbandoni e ritorni.* Roma. Donzelli.

Thompson J., Scoones I. (1994), Challenging the Populist Perspective: Rural People's Knowledge. Agricultural Research and Extension practice. *Agricultural and Human Values*, Spring/Summer, pp. 58-76.

Toledo V. M., Barrera-Bassols N. (2009), *La memoria biocultural. La importancia ecológica de las sabidurías tradicionales.* Madrid: Icaria.

Watson, S., Waterton E. (2010), Editorial. Heritage and community engagement. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16 (1-2), pp. 1-3.

Welsh J., Mac Rae R. (1998), Food Citizenship and Community Food Security: Lessons from Toronto, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement.* 19 (4), pp. 237-255.

Wolf, E. (1956/1971), Aspects of group relations in a complex society: Mexico. In T. Shanin (ed.), *Peasants and peasant societies*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, pp. 50–68.

Wolverton S, Nolan J.M., Ahmed W. (2014), Ethnobiology, political ecology, and conservation. *Journal of Ethnobiology*, 34(2), pp. 125–152.

Zumpano C. (Ed.) (2020), *Migrazioni, Agricoltura, Ruralità. Politiche e percorsi per lo sviluppo dei territori. Rapporto di ricerca*. Roma. CREA.